CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 11. FEBRUARY, 1937. Vol. XXVI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Rumanian Repercussions.

The negotiations with the Rumanian Orthodox Church have caused deep searchings of heart in Evangelical and Modernist Church circles, not because intercommunion is not desired with the Rumanians, but because the Bucharest Formula, intended to serve as a starting-point and basis for such intercommunion, is regarded by Modernists as initiating the wrong mode of approach and also as threatening to make intercommunion with our British Free Churchmen more difficult to achieve in the future.

We publish in this issue the Memorandum dealing with the Rumanian negotiations, adopted by the Council of the M.C.U. by a vote of twenty to three, which by direction of the Council was transmitted to our bishops for their consideration. It was this Memorandum, vigorously opposed by the Dean of St. Paul's at the M.C.U. Council of January 19, which was the immediate cause of his regrettable resignation of the Presidency of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

For Modernists, whilst intercommunion with Rumanians is undoubtedly desirable, intercommunion with our British Free Churchmen is a matter of supreme and urgent necessity. However favourably we may be disposed towards the Rumanians, we cannot and must not allow the good in this case to be the

enemy of the better. We are convinced that nothing must be allowed to check or subvert the realization of intercommunion at an early date with our own Free Churchmen.

An English diplomatist expressed his hope that the Great War might lead to the Europeanization of the Balkans, but confessed with sorrow at a later stage that it had really resulted in the Balkanization of Europe. There surely can be no need for English Churchmen to Balkanize their own Church in order to secure intercommunion with the Rumanians. If such a sacrifice is demanded by the Rumanians it is one which we as Englishmen, in the interests of the Christian Religion itself and of the human race, ought not to make.

We are convinced that our more discerning English prelates (witness the recent utterance by the Archbishop of York in the Church Assembly, as reported in the *Times* of February 8, 1937) recognize the urgent need for securing intercommunion with our Nonconformist neighbours so closely united to us by race, citizenship, education, culture and religious experience. We use the same English Bible and sing the same hymns; are educated at the same Universities and share the same political and social ideals. We *penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos*,[1] in some ways, hardly less to-day than in the days of Vergil, ought certainly first to secure religious unity among ourselves before we can usefully achieve it with foreign races. Moreover, and this is at least as important in the achievement of reunion of the right kind — by which we mean a reunion which promises to be both permanent and influential — this reunion can only be achieved by going forward, not by going back into the past.

To enquire curiously into where we stand in relation to ancient ecclesiastical and theological controversies as a preliminary to intercommunion is as fatuous a proceeding as it must prove futile. We can only unite on the great simplicities of the Christian religious experience which are as profound as they are permanent.

Resignations and Reasons.

The two following letters, dealing with the recent division of opinion within the Modern Churchmen's Union published in the

[1] The Britons divided quite from all the world (Vergil, Eclogue i, 67).

Times of February 8 and February 13 respectively will be of interest to many of our readers at home and abroad.

SIR,

The members of the Modern Churchmen's Union will know by now that we have felt obliged to sever our official connexion with the Union.

We feel that we ought not to take this step without explaining to the public and to our fellow-members the reasons which have led us to do as we have done.

The last meeting of the Council showed us that the line we had been led to take on very important questions did not have the support of our colleagues.

But this disagreement on particular issues is, as it appears to us, a sign of a wider disagreement with the majority of the Council. We remain firm supporters of the Modernist movement, and in no way wish to draw back from our work for that cause. We feel, however, that the Union is in danger of contracting its sympathies, and so making it impossible for those of our friends whose outlook is not exclusively Protestant to become, or to remain, active members of the Union.

We are anxious for a wider and more tolerant form of Modernism, which shall include Anglo-Catholic Modernists as well as Liberal Evangelicals.

We feel ourselves often out of sympathy with the line taken by the *Modern Churchman*, which, although not under the control of the Union, is generally thought by the public to be its official organ.

We realize how much the *Modern Churchman* has done for the Union, but we feel that a wider Modernism, which interests itself perhaps less with academic theology and more with those issues which fill the thoughts of the younger generation, is the need of our age, and the cause to which we want to give whatever energies we have.

Believing ourselves to be in a minority in regard to these questions among our fellow-members of the Council, we feel it is better to resign from office than to perpetuate dissension within the Union.

We are, Sir, yours, etc.,

W. R. MATTHEWS, EDWARD ST. G. SCHOMBERG, H. R. L. SHEPPARD, HAROLD ANSON, W. M. BROWNE, NORMAN SYKES.

SIR,

The Dean of St. Paul's and his friends who have resigned office in the Modern Churchmen's Union charge the Union with so contracting its sympathies that it may become impossible for those whose outlook is not exclusively Protestant to be active members. They affirm that they themselves are anxious for a wider form of Modernism which would be congenial to Anglo-Catholics as well as to Evangelicals, and that they would wish the Union to interest itself less in academic theology and more in 'those issues which fill the thoughts of the younger generation.' The younger generation is much concerned with social, political and economic issues, and it would therefore seem that it is with matters of this nature that the Dean and his friends would wish the Union to concern itself.

No member of the Council desires that the Union should be exclusively Protestant in colour. It never has been, nor is it likely to become so. Anglo-Catholics have always been welcome, and they will

be no less welcome in the future. But it ought to be clear that no one will be likely to feel at home in the Union unless he is Liberal in his conception of the character of the Christian Church as well as in matters of doctrine. That is the immediate cause of the divergence between the minority and the majority of the Council. The majority were as eager as the minority for Intercommunion with the Roumanian Church. They objected, however, to Intercommunion being based on an alleged doctrinal agreement. They feared that the acceptance of this basis would be prejudicial to the prospects of Intercommunion with the non-episcopal churches at home. They believe that the Union ought to continue to stand for ecclesiastical as well as for doctrinal Liberalism.

It is not easy to draw a line between 'academic' and other theology. The Union from its inception has held that Liberalism in theology is of great importance to the cause of a religion which, while rooted in the past, must be capable of influencing the thought of the present. We believe that a living theology must be a Liberal theology. The urgency of the need for such a theology may not be lightly deprecated by the introduction of the word 'academic.'

The Union is interested, and will continue to be interested, in the application of Christian principles in public as well as in private life. We may here refer not only to the subject-matter of past Conferences, but to the fact that at the next Annual Conference, among cognate subjects, 'Christianity and Civilisation,' 'Christianity and Communism,' 'Christianity and Fascism,' will be the subjects of papers. At the same time it is unlikely that a society which exists for the Advancement of Liberal Religious Thought will secure the adherence of its members to a single political, social, or economic programme. Nor is it desirable that it should do so.

In conclusion, we express our satisfaction that Dr. Matthews and the others who have resigned their official positions are not resigning their membership of the Union, and are determined to continue to support that Modernist Movement which they and we alike have closely at heart.

P. Gardner (*ex-President*).

Vice-Presidents:

Cyril Norwood.	W. D. Morrison.
Hubert Handley.	H. D. A. Major.

Members of the Council.

L. B. Cross.	Archibald F. Robson.
M. T. Dunlop.	W. F. Stiff.
R. G. Griffith.	H. J. Trueman.
G. L. H. Harvey.	H. F. Walker.
Hilda Hubbard.	J. W. Walker.
H. P. Kingdon.	Dorothy Humphry Ward.
R. R. Lewis.	Douglas White.
G. Milner.	J. L. Wilson.
R. D. Richardson.	Alice M. Ashley.

The first letter gives reasons for the recent resignations from the Council of the M.C.U., the second letter rebuts those reasons.

Aristotle expressed the opinion that although men differ about small things the reason for their difference is never small. This will explain why the reasons given for actions are in so many cases quite inadequate to explain the actions themselves. All actions by groups are determined by mixed motives: there are cross-currents: wheels within wheels: 'reasons and reasons' and the analysis of them in this case would demand more space than they deserve.

What, however, is observable is:

(1) That although the M.C.U. is preponderantly lay in its membership, the seven officials who have resigned their posts are all clerics.

(2) That although the M.C.U. is a very widespread society and has the bulk of its members living outside London, yet those who have resigned belong only to the Metropolitan area.

(3) That, put broadly, the underlying cause for the resignations is that the President and his friends desire that the M.C.U. should be more Anglo-Catholic in its membership and more socialist in its sympathies than it has been during the long reign of its former President, Dean Inge.

Anglo-Catholicism is the dominant power in the Church today, and Socialism the coming power in the State. It is therefore natural enough that the circumspective and forward glancing eye of Dean Matthews, should desire to see the M.C.U. more Anglo-Catholic and more Socialist than it is. But whilst there is a place and a welcome for all Anglo-Catholics and for all Socialists who wish to join the M.C.U., they must find their spiritual home there, not because they are Anglo-Catholics or because they are Socialists, but because they are Liberal or Modernist Churchmen.

The primary purpose and duty of the M.C.U., that indeed for which it came into existence nearly forty years ago, is to promote theological and ecclesiastical Liberalism within the Church of England. If it be asked what is this theological and ecclesiastical Liberalism we reply: it is loyalty to Christ's Spirit of truth, freedom, and love in our Church teaching and Church policies.

The fact that those who have resigned, have resigned, not their membership of the M.C.U. but only their offices in it, indicates, as does their letter, that they value the contribution which Modernism is making to our Church life but that they are not satisfied with the methods of the M.C.U. in its support and propagation of Modernism. We are in agreement with them here, but for other reasons than those which they give. Although we regard some of the charges made against the M.C.U. Council as unjust and exaggerated, we agree entirely with the need for seriously taking stock of the activities and methods of the M.C.U., and considering whether they could not be rendered much more effective.

We could have wished that our President and his friends, instead of resigning so suddenly and dramatically and with so much publicity, had summoned a meeting of the Council for the express purpose of considering the whole question. We believe that such action might have proved much more beneficial to the Modernist cause than the line which they have taken, and certainly much more beneficial to the society of which they are members.

The Sphere and Policy of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

The Modern Churchmen's Union was founded in 1898, not to bring together in recurring friendly conferences representatives of the Anglo-Catholic, Evangelical and Liberal schools in the Church of England, helpful and delightful as such conferences might prove to be, but to be a society for the promotion of theological liberalism, and also of ecclesiastical liberalism, not only in the spheres of thought and teaching but also in the sphere of practical church policy. It is this taking of practical action which a number of our members may reasonably regard as inadvisable and as not coming properly within the sphere of the M.C.U.'s activities. Decisive practical action by the M.C.U. in various church crises has invariably led to resignations from its ranks. This is of course regrettable, but we fear inevitable in such a society where Liberal Anglo-Catholics, in Church disputes, will almost certainly be led to take the opposite side from Liberal Evangelicals—the ancient loyalties of each group leading to the temporary suppression of their liberalism.

Our ex-President's remedy for this would seem to be that the M.C.U. should be an educational society only; holding meetings and conferences, delivering sermons and addresses, publishing magazines, pamphlets and books, but not intervening in practical church politics, whether it be prayer-book revision, interchange of pulpits, women and the ministry, marriage and divorce, eugenics and birth-control, ordination vows, the relations of Church and State, the South India scheme, religious teaching in our schools, pacificism, and Christian reunion at home and abroad. We believe that to accept such a limitation, by which the results of theory and research are separated from their practical application in our Church life, would be a serious mistake and greatly reduce the usefulness of the M.C.U. For most English people

'*Grau, theurer Freund, ist alle Theorie*
Und grün des Lebens goldner Baum.'[1]

They have with rare exceptions little interest in research and theories, ideals and ideas, apart from their practical applications. If however the M.C.U. should decide to confine itself to its educational task alone we should not dissent nor feel that by such limitation the M.C.U. had not much needful work to do. It was Professor Lake who warned Modernists that in our Church life we should have to choose between being the leaven or the lump, and he was sure that we ought to limit ourselves to trying to be the leaven.

There is, however, yet another problem facing the M.C.U. What is to be the limit in the range of subjects which it ought rightfully to investigate and in relation to which to undertake educational work? Dean Matthews, with others, feels strongly that the study of the problems of economics and politics in their relation to Christianity should form an important part of the M.C.U. research and teaching. This has not been the case hitherto, although a number of M.C.U. members are not only keenly interested in, but also hard workers in, these spheres. Before turning the M.C.U. into a society primarily devoted to these popular problems we think it well to weigh the objections against such a course.

[1] 'Grey, my dear friend, is all theory, and green the golden tree of life.'
—*Faust*, Part I.

(1) The M.C.U. has no particular qualifications in the spheres of economics, sociology and politics.

(2) There are a great number of excellent societies much better equipped than is the M.C.U. for doing this work, of which societies many of the M.C.U. are members.

(3) These subjects are not only highly controversial and closely connected with various types of partizan politics, but they would certainly prove a devisive factor in the M.C.U. in comparison with which the differences of Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals would pale into insignificance. Communism, Fascism, and various brands of Socialism, conflicting theories of wages, currency, property, etc., would provide the M.C.U. with all the explosive potentialities of a barrel of gunpowder, and to what purpose? What we can achieve in this sphere would have little worth.

(4) But, most serious objection of all, so absorbing are these themes that the M.C.U. would inevitably withdraw its attention and energy from the primary purpose for which it came into existence — namely, to promote theological and ecclesiastical liberalism.

It is not only asserted by many that theological liberalism, and the grounds upon which it is based, have no interest to-day for young people, since it is remote from their thinking and studies, but that there is an even more important reason for not troubling further with theological liberalism. It is that in England its work is done — done by the faculties of theology in Oxford and Cambridge, many of whose members have been members of the M.C.U. It is often asserted by our optimists, that all our clergy are of course as liberal theologically as it is possible for them to be, and our bishops, if possible, more liberal than they ought to be. Those who frequent the meetings of clerical societies will not feel convinced that this is the case. On the contrary, there is still much work for liberal theology to accomplish, not only among the rank and file of the clergy, but among the vast multitudes of laity — especially the young laity — mainly outside the Church to-day. In the face of the opposing forces of Fundamentalism, Romanism, Barthianism, and not least of all secularism, there is much exacting work to be done by the liberal theologians.

As for ecclesiastical liberalism, it received a great stimulus in the days of the war, but since 1920 it has steadily declined in influence. It is true that a number of the Free Church leaders are on friendly terms with the Primate, and even on occasions dine with the Bishops at the Athenaeum, although precluded from partaking with them at the Lord's Table. But the ecclesiastical liberalism of which the Christian religion stands in need to-day in this country must include the rank and file of the laity and lead to the healing of our sectarian divisions and rivalries. Amazing as it may seem, the bitterest and most influential antagonists of ecclesiastical liberalism are found within the Christian Church itself, and chiefly within the ranks of the clergy. Ecclesiastical liberalism now exists much more outside the churches than within them, and this is one important cause for their declining numbers and waning influence.

If the Christian cause in this country is not to succumb before the forces of Paganism, as it has done in such appalling fashion on the continent, it can only be as the result of theological and ecclesiastical liberalism doing its increasingly needful work in the unification and rejuvenation of the Christian forces in this country. This is the proper task of the M.C.U., and we hope that it will put it first and foremost even though it be not viewed with favour by some Church authorities.

As for the young people and the proletariat, although they know very little about theological and ecclesiastical liberalism and have very little interest in it, yet they would be overwhelmingly in favour of it if only they could be instructed and interested, and it is needful from every point of view, personal, social and political, that they should be so instructed. It is a hard task, but the M.C.U. must not turn aside from it to undertake more attractive and popular enterprises. *Σπάρτην ἔλαχες, ταύτην κόσμει*—Sparta is your country, make the most of it.

'Repellent Novelties.'

We have been sharply rebuked by the Editor of the *Guardian* and others for referring in our January issue (p. 522) to 'mass vestments' as 'repellent novelties.' We are charged with speaking as Evangelicals or Protestant Dissenters: not as Modernists. It is affirmed that Modernists are not concerned with

these Vestiarian Controversies, and by speaking of mass vestments as repellent novelties they give needless offence not only to Anglo-Catholics but to Liberal Anglo-Catholics. If the context of our phrase be carefully studied it will be seen that we are not describing the Modernist point of view with regard to mass vestments. What we are describing is the way in which a great body of our fellow-Churchmen view mass vestments. They are for them 'repellent novelties' in their parish churches. This we pointed out is a fact which must be taken into serious consideration by our Church authorities when inviting the laity who have deserted their parish churches to return to them again. Some of the clergy may regard these laity as prejudiced, uneducated, unaesthetic, but such an estimate of them is not calculated to make things better or assist the effectiveness of the Primate's appeal. Mass vestments and their accompaniments have driven many parishioners from their parish churches. We venture to cite a personal experience. We were instituted some years ago to a derelict little rural parish which had been served by a devoted priest who had introduced mass vestments and their accompaniments. As a consequence the farmers and 'their wretched serfs' (his own phrase) had ceased to attend the services.

When we undertook the pastoral charge, mass vestments were left for us if we would consent to use them. Had we done so, the parishioners, instead of returning to their church, would have remained away.

There are any number of other parishes in which similar actions would have similar results. Modernists have no objection to wearing whatever clerical vesture is customary, and approved of by the congregation, but the introduction of 'repellent novelties' into our Church Services, not only without the consent, but aginst the will of the parishioners, has in recent years lost the Church of England a vast body of adherents, and practical steps ought to be taken to remedy this situation. To write this is not Protestantism but pastoral common-sense.

May we add that we did not raise the issue of mass vestments? That issue was raised by the recent introduction of mass vestments into Canterbury Cathedral just before the Primate's Recall to Religion. And we fear that what Canterbury Cathedral

has done will inevitably lead to the forcing of vestments upon a number of unwilling congregations in the Southern province. The Modernist attitude towards the wearing of mass vestments ought to be that of St. Paul towards food that had been sacrificed to idols: 'Meat will not commend us to God: neither if we eat not are we the worse; nor if we eat are we the better . . . Wherefore if meat maketh my brother to stumble I will eat no flesh for evermore, that I make not my brother to stumble' (I *Cor.* viii, vv. 8, 13).

Remarried Divorced Persons and the Sacraments.

Modernists must feel deeply thankful for the line taken by our Episcopate in reference to the admission to the Sacraments of divorced persons who have married while a former partner is yet living.

The Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury on January 21, 1937, came to the following decision that the Bishop of the Diocese after consultation with the parish priest may under certain conditions permit the admission of remarried divorced persons to Holy Communion.

The prescribed conditions are as follows:

I.—That, after due consideration of all the factors involved, this House considers that the most salutary form of discipline applicable to the circumstances of the day, which can be adopted by the Church of England, is as follows:—

When two persons have contracted a legal marriage during the lifetime of a former partner of one of them or of their former partners, and either or both persons desire to be baptized or to partake of the Holy Communion, the Bishop of the diocese wherein such person or persons reside shall be informed by the parish priest of the facts of the case, and if, in view of the facts, he be satisfied then or subsequently—

(1) That the parties after mature reflection and in all good conscience are fully persuaded that it is right for them to live together as man and wife, and

(2) that the admission of the person or persons to the Sacraments (*a*) would not give reasonable grounds of grave offence to the Church, nor to any member thereof who might feel especially aggrieved, and (*b*) would not be to the hurt of their own souls, whether by reason of their impenitence in respect of any sin which their own conscience recognizes as such, or for any other cause.

(3) That the parties have habitually resided in the diocese for the last six months.

(4) That the parties have or have not made a previous application to the Bishop of any other diocese.

The Bishop shall give direction in writing that the person or persons shall not be, or, after such period as he may determine, shall not continue to be repelled from the Sacraments on account of the marriage thus contracted, and such decision ought to be communicated to the parish priest and accepted as final both in the particular diocese and in all other dioceses of the Province.

II.—That when the Bishop has been informed that such a marriage is contemplated he shall if possible take counsel with the parties concerned with special reference to the question of their future admission to Holy Communion.

The Upper House of the Convocation of York unanimously took the same line as that of Canterbury, where only two bishops had been in opposition.

We are equally glad that Mr. Herbert's Marriage and Divorce Bill which is now ready for its third reading is receiving strong support from the Bishops, and not least from the Bishop of Durham. The following extract from his letter published in the *Times* on February 10, puts the whole matter in the way in which Modernists would have it presented :

Knowledge and experience, as these are gradually accumulated, must have their rightful influence on the Christian's view of marriage. As little in the case of morality as in that of theology did the Church enter on its course with a full equipment of the truth. In a famous sentence, Dr. Hort gives the key to the solution of many problems—'The lesson-book of the Ecclesia, and of every Ecclesias, is not a law but a history.'

Christian morality has developed, is developing, and must continue to develop. The principles of Christ have to be applied to human life in ever fresh situations. When we seriously take account of the new factors—biological, medical, social—which must be reckoned with by the modern legislator, it is surely apparent that change in the law is requisite.

A breach between the Church and the State on the subject of marriage would be very deplorable, and ought not to be induced unless the necessity be apparent. Such a breach is certainly not required by the extension of the grounds of divorce which Mr. Herbert's Bill would allow. On the contrary, I am persuaded that the stability of marriage will be better secured by the removal from the law of defects which are apparent and widely baleful. These alienate from the support of stable marriage great numbers of citizens who are assuredly no friends to sexual laxity.

The President of the Mothers' Union (assuming a more than episcopal authority) has called upon her fellow-members to write to their members of Parliament urging them to vote against Mr. Herbert's Bill, and there are 'die-hards' on the Bench who will no doubt welcome such irregular assistance. Nevertheless, I allow myself to think that Parliament may be trusted to consider the Bill on its merits, and to base its decision on large grounds of reason and equity.

THE RUMANIAN NEGOTIATIONS

THE following memorandum on the Rumanian negotiations was adopted by the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union at their meeting on January 19, 1937, and was immediately transmitted to the English Bishops with a brief covering letter which stated :

> 'That the Report of the Conference at Bucharest* presents an interpretation of the faith of the Anglican Communion which, while no hindrance to inter-Communion, is not consonant with the Anglican position.'

The Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union, having carefully considered the Report of the Conference at Bucharest between the Rumanian Commission on Relations with the Anglican Communion and the Church of England Delegation appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, is agreed as follows :

(1) We desire to state at the outset that we welcome all movements towards closer association and co-operation between the Christian Churches, whether between the Denominations in this country and in the Mission Field, or between the Church of England and Churches abroad. We especially welcome signs of a readiness in various Churches to sanction Intercommunion. In this and all expressions of the realization that Christians are members one of another we see the presence of the Holy Spirit working in the Churches severally as He will. We bear in mind the lead given to us by the authorities of the Church of England in the Call to Union made at Lambeth in 1920, and to it we would gladly respond. Concerning the Rumanian Church, we would welcome the possibility of fellowship with them at the Holy Communion, the more frequent interchange of ideas between them and us, and the fullest co-operation with them in the preaching and living of the Gospel of Christ. We do not therefore approach the Report of the Bucharest Conference in an unsympathetic spirit. We recognize that the main purpose of the Conference was to secure those ideals of Reunion. We must, however, and with deep regret, dissociate ourselves from the means employed at the Conference and from the conclusions

*Published by Press and Publications Board of Church Assembly, Church House, Westminster, S.W.1, May, 1936. 1/-.

reached, and in part we do so on the ground that such means and conclusions must in the long run hinder Reunion as between the Church of Rumania and the Church of England and as between our two Churches and the other Churches and Denominations of Christendom.

(2) We believe that full recognition by one Church of another, co-operation between them and fellowship together at Holy Communion, may be simply had on one sufficient condition, that both Churches respectively in their formularies, worship and life avow Christ to be the Revelation of God and acknowledge as their own that view of God and of man, and of the relationship between them, which is manifest and plain in the New Testament. Futhermore, while the freest interchange of ideas between Christians is desirable and necessary, we are convinced that the whole attempt to find some formula of 'full dogmatic agreement' as a condition of co-operation in the practical field of human relations, is pointless and barren, and contrary to the Christian experience of the working of the Divine Spirit in the minds of men. We, therefore, deplore the dogmatic approach of the Bucharest Conference to the matter of Reunion as misguided.

Concerning Intercommunion, we would urge that fellowship at Holy Communion is everywhere recognized as a solemn Christian act carrying obligations of conduct, that it is an act without advantage or attraction for those who are not Christians, and that therefore the desire to share in this solemn fellowship is itself evidence of the right to share. We also recognize that individual Churches have, for their part, the right to lay down conditions of membership, provided those conditions are in keeping with the Gospel of Christ.

(3) We note that the specific purpose of the Archbishop's Delegation to the Rumanian Church was not in the first instance to promote the practice of Intercommunion between our two Churches, which practice we would immediately welcome, but to discuss with the Rumanian Church certain questions of Doctrine and Order with a view to discovering whether or not the Rumanian Church could recognize the validity of Anglican Orders. We note that as a consequence of the positions taken

by the Anglican Delegation, the Rumanian Commission is able to advise the Holy Synod to recognize Anglican Orders. We note also that the Anglican Delegation writes that in the course of the discussions agreement was reached on certain questions of Doctrine and Orders, and that the Anglican Delegation believes

> 'By these agreements . . . a solid basis has been prepared for further discussions whereby full dogmatic agreement may be affirmed between the Orthodox and the Anglican Communions.'

The inference must be that the Anglican Delegation represented to the Rumanian Commission that the agreements set out in this Report express the Doctrine of the Church of England at the present time, or are in conformity with that Doctrine. It is this assumption which we must emphatically deny, and not only on behalf of our Union, but also in the name of the greater part of the Christian laity in this country and in the British Commonwealth. We are astonished that the accredited Delegates of the Archbishop of Canterbury should have put forward the Agreements in this Report as harmonious with the doctrines of the Church of England; and for the very sake of permanent good relations with the Rumanian Church, possible only when real differences are frankly recognized, we must draw the attention of the Holy Synod of Rumania to the wide divergence between the terms of this Report and the Anglican position as it is commonly held to-day.

(*a*) The Report quotes as a guiding principle a statement made by the Anglican Delegation which said that:

> '"The Doctrine of the Anglican Church is authoritatively expressed in the Book of Common Prayer, and that the meaning of the XXXIX Articles must be interpreted in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer" (see Lambeth Conference, 1930, p. 139), and that therefore the XXXIX Articles are to be regarded as a document secondary to the Book of Common Prayer.'

We are in doubt as to what, if any, is the meaning to be attached to this statement. The obvious purpose of the Reformers in drawing up the Articles was to define the Doctrine of the Church of England, which, in the nature of the case, can only be implicit in a book of Public Prayers and Services. We are, therefore, unable to understand how the Thirty-nine Articles can be secondary to the Book of Common Prayer as a doctrinal docu-

ment. The present Declaration of Assent required of those seeking Orders in the Church of England is one of assent equally to the Articles and to the Prayer Book. Further, in so far as this Report departs from the doctrine of the Thirty-nine Articles, it departs also from the Rubrics of the Prayer Book which govern and interpret the Services it contains.

We acknowledge that neither the Thirty-nine Articles nor the Book of Common Prayer are fully adequate expressions of the Christian Religion as it is held and practised to-day by the great majority of our countrymen at home and overseas, and we do not cite against the Report either the Articles or the Rubrics as precise and binding statements of the Anglican position at the present time. Scholarship, thought and the discoveries of science require us to modify much which the Reformers wrote, make necessary for us certain amplifications of the Worship and Doctrine of the sixteenth century, and have produced a temper of mind and a development of the Christian experience significant of our age. Nevertheless, the Articles and the Prayer Book are the first expressions of the continuing mind and spirit of Anglicanism; the contemporary development is not a rejection of the Reformers' teaching but a growth from it which remains rooted in it, and it is our duty to advise the Holy Synod that, for many of our clergy and the great mass of our laity, contemporary Anglicanism, so far as it is a development from the Articles and the Prayer Book, is a development in the opposite direction to that taken by the deviations in this Report from the sixteenth century position.

(*b*) While we deprecate the attempt to find a formula to express the significance of the Holy Communion; and while, in accordance with the Mind and Will revealed in the New Testament, we cannot think that Intercommunion between any two Churches should wait upon their agreement upon some formula, we must reject the formula contained in this Report as out of keeping with the Anglican Spirit.

First, no regard is had for contemporary scholarly understanding of the various New Testament accounts of the Last Supper and the Institution. Second, although in the Report the manner of the working of the act of consecration is said to be a mystery, it is plainly implied that consecration works a change

in the elements. This is a view contrary to sound reason and to the cardinal tenets of Anglican Eucharistic teaching.

(*c*) We recognise that the Report frankly records some difference between the Rumanian and Anglican Churches, as represented at the Conference, concerning Confirmation, Absolution, the Marriage Blessing, Holy Orders and the Unction of the Sick. We cannot accept either the Rumanian or the Anglican formula. The Anglican formula groups these various rites and ceremonies under one head for discussion as to their nature, a proceeding which is illogical, unhistorical and unscriptural.

In the discussion upon Ordination we observe that the members of the Bucharest Conference had as their common starting-point 'the statements interchanged between the Orthodox Delegation of 1930 and the Anglican Bishops with whom it conferred,' and that in paragraph 8 of the *Resumé* of these statements the Anglican Bishops declared

> 'that in the Anglican Communion Ordination is not merely the appointment of a man to a particular post, but that in Ordination a special *charisma* is given to the person Ordained, proper to the Order. . . .'

We are compelled to remind the Holy Synod of Rumania that while the Church of England, for itself, retains the historic three-fold ministry, it enunciates no doctrine of Holy Orders, nor does it make any statement that other types of ministry are invalid, or even irregular. We cannot but feel that our Church authorities, as represented by the Bishops responsible for this statement, have attempted seriously to restrict our Christian freedom which we as English Churchmen enjoy in this matter.

(*d*) We are compelled to reject the two implications of the Report, that Scripture and Tradition are both infallible; and that both have equal authority for the Christian mind and conscience. We would appeal for an approach both to Scripture and Tradition at once reverent, historical and critical, that the Spirit manifest in both may guide the life and practice of the Church to-day.

We regard the statement in the Report,

> 'Everything necessary for salvation can be founded upon Holy Scripture, as completed, explained, interpreted and understood in the Holy Tradition, by the guidance of the Holy Spirit residing in the Church,'

as a statement tending to subvert the essential Anglican position in relation to the Holy Scriptures, the study and experience of Anglicans, in the past as now, having convinced them that it is peculiarly in the New Testament that the norm of Christianity is to be found.

(4) Although we are compelled to criticize this Report as out of keeping with the Anglican spirit, that same spirit teaches us gladly to look forward to the closest association with the Church of Rumania. Yet, if loyal to itself, the Church of England cannot enter into association with any one Church on terms which preclude Intercommunion and co-operation with other Churches, and in particular with other Denominations in this country, except they be the fundamental terms of the Christian message as contained in the New Testament. We trust that our authorities will make as determined an effort to promote Intercommunion with the other Denominations at home as the effort witnessed to in this Report to reach an understanding with the Church of Rumania, and we plead with the Church of Rumania to envisage a form of unity with us that will permit also as close a unity between us and the other Denominations of our own country. We are persuaded that the Rumanian Church is ready so to do in the Spirit of Christ which is her's and our's. We respectfully ask the Archbishop of Canterbury not to take the serious step of recommending this Report, backed by his authority, for the consideration of the Anglican Communion, since such action on his part must lead to misunderstanding concerning the position of the Church of England and so gravely hinder Reunion both at home and abroad.

Although we dissociate ourselves from the Agreements in this Report we have the fullest sympathy with the intention of its framers, which has plainly sprung from the desire and hope that in the modern world, whose supreme need is for witness to Christ, the many members of His Body may once more be united in harmonious obedience to Him.

THE CHURCH OF THE FUTURE*

'Your fellowship in furtherance of the Gospel.' Phil. i, 5.

IN generations to come, when Christianity has spread over all the world, and no other religion but only godlessness remains to dispute the universal sway of Christ, and men look back over history to trace the course of the world's religion, they will give a place of high honour to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Strange as it may seem, the same age that saw the first great development of mechanical power and scientific discovery will be seen to be the greatest age of religious advance.

Without the perspective that a few centuries will give, it is difficult for anyone but historians to appreciate the age in which we live.

To get the measure of present-day religious movements, consider the pace at which religion has developed or spread in other ages. The simple belief in nature spirits and in the spirits of the dead, which is found in many primitive tribes to-day, is probably but little in advance of the beliefs held by man 25,000 years ago. Hinduism in the course of several thousand years has attained a pantheistic philosophy for the learned, and has encouraged mystics to seek communion with a God of whom little is known, but has left the mass of the people in a primitive state of polytheism. Zoroastrianism prospered for a thousand years, and at the end of that time was no further advanced than Zoroaster. The most rapid religious development, apart from outside influence, was that of the Hebrew race; but reckoning from Abraham to Christ it took over two thousand years to develop from polytheism and animism to the religion in which Christianity had its birth. The first spread of Christianity in Europe is generally thought of as rapid, but the area covered was not large, and three hundred years had passed before it was acknowledged as the religion of the Roman Empire. In a sense the spread of Islam was incomparably rapid. The Arabs themselves accepted the new

* The Ramsden Sermon preached by the Rev. L. E. Browne, D.D., Sidney Sussex College, in Great St. Mary's Church, on Sunday, May 24th, 1936, reprinted with kind permission from the *Cambridge Review*.

religion in the life-time of Muhammad, but the change for them, and for the races conquered by Muslim armies, was at the beginning as much political as religious. The religion of Islam that emerged after two hundred years was more a synthesis of previously existing elements than a spontaneous development; and, once having received all that it could absorb from Christian and Greek sources, Islam entered upon the stagnation of thought that has marked it since the fifteenth century.

I do not know how the theological work of Christians in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries will strike our successors. Possibly it may appear a greater achievement than it sometimes seems to us. Certainly Christianity has affected the social life of England in a way that it never did before. The emergence of materialism into open daylight has been more than counterbalanced by the growing zeal of those who call themselves Christians. But it is the numerical and territorial expansion overseas that is most striking. Within less than a century and a half more than seven million Indians have embraced Christianity, and their numbers are more than doubling every thirty years. Quite recently the outcastes of Travancore, numbering over a million persons, sent seventy representatives to the Bishop and asked to be prepared for baptism. Similar vast movements are expected among the outcastes of other parts of India. In spite of the common assertion that Muslims are never converted, 60,000 Muslims of Java have become Christian in three-quarters of a century. In China 4,000,000 Scripture portions are taken up every year. In 130 years the Bible Society has translated the Scriptures into over 700 languages. When all allowances have been made for conversions that take place from motives other than religious, the witness, which we who have lived in the mission field can give, to the power of the Spirit of Christ working in the infant Churches, cloth these dry statistics with life. The onward march of the Church to-day outstrips the speed of the first conversion of Europe. Multitudes are being raised, faster than ever in history, from lower religions to one incomparably higher.

For the most part, those who are actually engaged in the missionary task are unable to see it in this perspective. Whether you

think of poor people at home who save their pence for the cause; or missionaries toiling on for long years, over-worked, underpaid, separated from their families, disappointed by failures and still going on, only supported by the evident signs of the power of Christ in converted souls; their view is that of the daily tasks and nearest duties, and rarely are they granted to see their work as part of a grand triumphal march.

Do not let us therefore, who can view it in that light, imagine that Christ's kingdom advances of its own momentum, or forget the toils and tears of the thousands who are co-operating with Christ for the world's salvation. The historian can see the romance of it; the workers themselves the duty to be done.

It is only by co-operation that the work can go forward. There was a wise provision made by King David that the share of the spoil of him that goeth down to the battle should be as the share of him that tarrieth by the stuff. This ordinance of the equal shares of the spoils was based upon a recognition of the equal value of the work.

I have often heard missionary sermons in which the preacher urged his hearers to pray for the work, and if possible also to give their money for its support. Those are elementary needs, and they do not exhaust the possibilities of co-operation. There is a contribution which a University is specially fitted to give, co-operation in thought.

Take an example from a problem now before our eyes. From the mission field comes the urge for reunion of the divided Church. When you hear of schemes for reunion in South India and in Persia, do not imagine that they are grounded on mere expediency, or on impatience with the hindrance caused by division. There, where the work is going forward, and new Churches are being built up, the Spirit of God is abroad to inspire men to build better than in the past. The evident inspiration is there; but there are few leaders capable of putting it into operation. They look to leaders of thought at home, to men learned in Church history, to show the way to make the will of God an actuality. Too often, alas, the proposals for reunion are met at home by carping criticism, by insistence on trivial details, by theoretical considerations which bear no relation to the actual

conditions of the present day, and with the same lack of trust in the intentions of fellow-Christians which caused our divisions in the first instance. We desire from those at home, first the recognition that this inspiration comes from God, and then the guidance to express it wisely and to heed the warnings of past history.

But I speak to-day of more fundamental problems of the mind, in which those engaged in the propagation of the Gospel need the intellectual assistance of scholars at home.

Christian theology, as we know it, developed in Europe in face of certain heretical tendencies which were the heritage of European heathenism. The Councils of the early Church met to explain and defend the Christian revelation against the errors then prevalent; and the creeds were intended to guard in summary form the truths that were brought to light by long-debated controversies. Our modern theology has followed the same lines, and sought in addition to express the truth in the light of modern scientific thought, of historical criticism, and most recently of all in the light of modern psychology.

But in the mission field to-day we are in the midst of problems which never arose in the West, and are faced by masses of people whose system of thought is different from anything that the European Church has ever had to deal with.

It is not surprising that Christianity has made most headway with primitive peoples whose polytheism and animism are closely parallel to the beliefs of the ancient Canaanites. The missionary who has studied the Old Testament knows how to deal with them. But the missionary, even if highly trained in theology, from early Christian doctrine to modern psychology, is at a loss how to deal with the entirely different problems raised by the great religions of Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam.

A request was recently made by a number of missionaries for an answer to the question. Why is idolatry wrong? That is a comparatively simple question, but it cannot be answered merely by a study of Church history. There was, it is true, a controversy in the eighth century about the use of images in the Church; but the arguments against them were based solely on the Second Commandment, which can have little weight for the modern

Christian, and none at all for the Hindu. The only satisfactory answer must be based upon the fundamental facts of the nature of God and of His revelation, and must include a denial of Pantheism, the doctrine prevalent in Hinduism that all that exists is God.

We come to problems far more difficult when we have to deal with the doctrines of the Trinity and of the dual nature of Christ. These doctrines are not the first principles of Christianity to be presented to our hearers, and, if the choice lay with us, the consideration of them would be deferred until the convert was enthralled with the love of Christ and recognized Him as Saviour. But unfortunately the prominence given to them in past controversies has made them familiar to all, and, as we might expect, totally misunderstood. To Muslim and Hindu alike the Trinity is polytheism, and to a Muslim the doctrine of the divine Sonship is a blasphemous statement of a carnal relationship. The Muslim enquirer invariably raises these questions, which the missionary, however well trained in theology, is unable to answer.

It is time that our theologians of the West tackled these problems afresh. The final form in which the doctrine of the Trinity was expressed in the Quicunque Vult is true enough as a legal statement, but it is lifeless. It bears no relation to living religious experience. It gives the impression of mathematical accuracy; but the mathematics that makes three equal to one is only intelligible when thought is transferred from the material to the spiritual sphere. The unity of God that the modern Christian looks for lies in moral character. The Quicunque Vult concerns itself with the dignity of three, of whom none is afore or after other; the Nicene creed concerns itself with the unity of essence of the Father and the Son. Neither gives any indication that the uniqueness of God lies in His holiness, and that we must seek to understand the divine unity in the realm of holiness. The holiness of God is the spear-point by which the thick armour of Islam and of Hinduism will be pierced, for neither has any acquaintance with that weapon.

The form in which the doctrine of the Trinity is commonly presented is a dogma which stirs no enthusiasm. But can it be

that the knowledge of the innermost being of God is not of thrilling interest? There is a faith in the Trinity which is thrilling, if only you can express it in a way that men's hearts can understand, a faith for which men would dare to die. Would not men die for their faith that Christ is the way to the Father, and that Christ's death is the story of the Father's love? Would not men die for their faith that the indwelling Spirit is the Spirit of Him who died on the cross, the Spirit of the Father of all? Surely the philosophy that lies beyond such vital phrases must itself be vital and arresting; and surely our theologians can give us that philosophy. We do not want it in order to win intellectual battles of debate with Muslims, but as the mystery of the inner being of God which corresponds with His dispensation for mankind; and if we can understand it, it will be a truth to live by, and if need be to die for.

Turn now to the equally fundamental question of the divinity and humanity of Christ. At the time when Islam arose the Church was united in two beliefs; on philosophical grounds they believed that God and man were separated by an unbridgeable gulf; on grounds of religious experience they believed that Christ was both God and man. As they were united in believing these two mutually contradictory statements, it is not surprising that they were divided in their explanation of the impossible. Nestorians and Jacobites believed they had explained it, and consequently were in error. Catholics knew they could not explain it, which was true but did not help faith. Muslims, not having the religious experience of Christ, denied the Incarnation and accepted the gulf between God and man. Is it not clear that we must restate the doctrine of the Incarnation? The ancients started by assuming that they knew the nature of God and the nature of man, accepting as axioms either the gulf between God and man postulated by Greek philosophy, or the statement of Genesis that man was made in the image of God. We must start with what we know of Christ in experience, and from Him learn the meaning and relationship of the divine nature and human nature. That is exactly what the modern missionary to Muslims is trying to do. He presents Christ to the Muslim, persuading him to read the gospel story, in the hope that he will come to

have the same religious experience of Christ that we have. But the intellectual difficulty still remains, even though the convert in the joy of his new faith forgets about it, until Christians are able to evolve a truer philosophy of the divine and human natures.

Exactly the same problem arises from the opposite side in dealing with Hinduism. For the Hindu pantheist believes that everything that exists is God. Material things may be a mere delusion, but if they exist they are God. The human soul is God. There is only one nature, the divine, and there can be no incarnation. The word *avatar*, commonly translated 'incarnation,' is obviously not an incarnation in the Christian sense, but only a manifestation of God through some portion of Himself.

I confess that if I had to choose between the Muslim belief that my soul is a machine created by God, with its every action foreordained, utterly unlike God whom I may not call Father, and the Hindu belief that my soul is identical with God, I should wish to choose the latter. But my conscience tells me that both are wrong. The moral evil of which I am conscious in myself forbids me to claim divinity; and yet I recognize within me some moral quality like that of God which compels me to call Him Father.

Many people to-day feel an imperative need to restate the Christian faith, not because they disbelieve the old creeds, but because modern needs and modern difficulties are different from the old. As a single example, we need now to emphasize that the Heavenly Father is of the same character as Jesus Christ, and this is a statement which has an appeal to the moral sense. This statement is not a contradiction of the credal clause that Christ is of one essence with the Father; indeed unity of character follows as a natural corollary from unity of essence; but, except for the few who are philosophers, the statement of the unity of essence stirs no deep emotions. The point that I now wish to make is this, that while our theologians are busy with the work of re-thinking and re-stating the faith in terms that the modern West can appreciate, they should also take into account the needs of the East. Out in the mission field our rising Churches are in terrible need of an expression of the faith that

will deal with the peculiar problems raised by Hinduism and Islam. It is remarkable how little of our theological literature is suitable, even with modifications, for translation into the vernaculars of the East, though the need for such work is great and growing.

The Western theologian can only take account of these special needs by close co-operation with Christians of the East. A study of other religions that is based upon their sacred writings, what is commonly called Comparative Religion, will carry one a long way. Many of the underlying beliefs of the modern adherents of these religions are to be found in their sacred books and the writings of their great men of the past. For that reason I plead for a deeper study of it by its introduction into our normal theological courses. But the co-operation which we desire must go further than a mere study of the past. The Muslim missionaries in England are aware that they cannot effectively attack Christianity if they restrict their study to the Bible and the creeds. They go further than that, and the literature pouring from the mosque at Woking shows an acquaintance with the Encyclopedia Biblica and with the arguments used by orators in Hyde Park. We need to do the same, and even more, especially as our purpose is not to attack and destroy the other man's religion, but to understand it and to know his lack. Thought is moving rapidly in the East as it is in the West, and if we are to be of assistance to the Churches of the East we must maintain close and living contact so as to be able to help them to meet the situation, not of thirty years ago, but of to-day.

I have spoken of reunion of the divided Church, and of co-operation between Churches of the East and the West. The two are part of one thing, the sharing in common life of the varied experiences of many brethren. The possibilities of Christian fellowship now opening up are greater than ever before in the history of Christendom. If, as I said at the beginning, the nineteenth and twentieth centuries would stand out in history as the greatest epoch of Christian extension, it may be that the twentieth and succeeding centuries will stand out as the epoch of realization of Christian fellowship. I only hesitate to use the word catholicity because it is capable of bearing more than one

meaning. But what we are beginning to find now is that Christians of different places, and different racial types, are able to share their experiences and outlook, and to gain a truer picture of Christ by a combination of different view-points. If may be that the conversion of the followers of the great religions, Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, Zoroastrianism, yes, and even Judaism, is awaiting a fuller and a richer Christianity than any single nation or continent can supply. These great religions are strongly entrenched in positions which have been established for centuries, and nothing but Christianity at its best and in all its fulness will suffice to win them for the truth as it is in Jesus. Their weakness lies, not so much in their particular errors, as in the inconsistencies and lack of harmony in their make-up. In that sense they are unstable systems, but their followers as a whole will not exchange them for anything that is not altogether stable. The partial truths of Christianity that any one part of the Church holds are not enough. They need a Christianity compacted of all the truth that man has ever found in Christ, the perfect harmony that will result when no note is missing.

This grand fellowship of Christians, this human Body of Christ, is not something which we of the West are creating for the benefit of our brethren in the East. It is the body which God Himself is preparing out of many components, East and West and South. If I have said that this great Church of the future will make an impression that no lesser Church can make on the ancient religions of the East, it is equally true that it will make its impression on the substitutes for religion against which the Western Church seems so powerless, those lesser and lower loyalties, Materialism, Secularism, Humanism, Nationalism. I do not know whether in the end there will be few or many remaining outside the kingdom of God. But this I know, that, when the Christian Church has reached the greatest fulness that the combined experiences of every nation can give it, there will remain outside the kingdom only those who rebel against every truth and choose the darkness rather than the light.

TOWARDS A NEW LITURGY

By the Rev. R. D. Richardson, M.A., B.Litt.

THE greatest need of the Church of England, *qua* Church of England, is to be true to itself. At the Reformation it embraced the duty both of accepting new truth and proclaiming it, for the distinguishing feature of our Church is the acceptance of all truth as Divine Revelation. The immediate result, however, was not a new *Summa Theologiae* but a *Book of Common Prayer*: acceptance of a new Revelation brings with it a new vision of God, and a new vision of God a new impulse to adore Him. To worship God in spirit and in truth was the cry of the Reformers who gave the Church of England that character which it is now challenged to uphold. The awakened soul must not be hindered in public worship from access to the Father by thoughts and words which sincerity demands that we should now discard. Nor must it be hindered from breathing itself forth in new forms of aspiration and praise. Particularly do we need a revised Office of Holy Communion. The period in which we are living is recognized by our Church authorities as one of liturgical experiment, and notable contributions towards a new Communion Office have already been made by the Green Book, the Grey Book, the Orange Book and the Deposited Book. So far, however, no agreement has been reached between the schools of thought within the Church. The following Service is published with acknowledgments to previous revisers, and with the prayer that it may prove to have been guided by the true spirit of the *Via Media Anglicana*, the only *via media* which unites opposites.

It would be helpful if those clergy who use this Office, and members of congregations where it is used, would, out of their experience of it, send suggestions to the compiler.

A musical setting for the first alternative Creed is already printed in *Songs of Praise*, and the same music lends itself to the second alternative Creed (and also to the Beatitudes if it is desired to sing these too). Those who sing the Proper Prefaces

will find no difficulty in fitting these, in their revised form, to the plainsong melody already in common use. For the rest, the numerous existing musical settings of the whole Service can be used with an alteration only to the music of *Gloria*. The compiler has already altered in this respect that excellent setting for congregational singing, Woodward in A flat, and will be glad to share with others the result of his effort.

An Alternative Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or

HOLY COMMUNION.

The Congregation standing, there shall be sung, if the Service be choral,

A Psalm or Hymn.

Then shall the Congregation kneel; and the Celebrant, standing at the Holy Table, shall say in an audible voice:

The Lord's Prayer.

Our Father, Which art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name; Thy Kingdom come; Thy Will be done; in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil. *Amen.*

The Collect for Singleness of Heart.

Almighty God, unto Whom all hearts be open, all desires known, and from Whom no secrets are hid: cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee and worthily magnify Thy Holy Name; through Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Then shall the Celebrant say, the people answering him, either

The Two Great Commandments,

Our Lord Jesus Christ said: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind and with all thy strength. This is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these.

People Lord, have mercy upon us, and write these Thy laws in our hearts, we beseech Thee.

or

THE BEATITUDES.

Blessed are the lowly in spirit:
People for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.
Blessed are they that mourn:
People for they shall be comforted.
Blessed are the merciful:
People for they shall obtain mercy.
Blessed are the peacemakers:
People for they shall be called the children of God.
Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness:
People for they shall be filled.
Blessed are the meek:
People for they inherit the earth.
Blessed are the pure in heart:
People for they shall see God.
Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake:
People for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.

Or the Beatitudes may be sung, if desired.

Then shall follow

THE COLLECT FOR THE DAY.

Then shall the Congregation sit (or remain kneeling) while the Celebrant, or other Minister, shall read

THE EPISTLE FOR THE DAY.

Then, the Congregation standing, shall be read

THE HOLY GOSPEL FOR THE DAY.

And before and after the reading of the Gospel shall the people say (or sing), respectively,

Glory be to Thee, O Lord.
Thanks be unto Thee, O Lord.

Then may be said, or sung,

A Confession of Faith;

We believe

God is Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.

God is Light: and if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.

God is Love: and every one that loveth is born of God and knoweth God.

Jesus is the Son of God: and God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.

We are children of God: and He hath given us of His Spirit.

If we confess our sins: He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.

The world passeth away and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever. *Amen.*

or

We believe in Thee, O God: the Father almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible.

Thou art God eternal: heaven and earth are full of the Majesty of Thy glory.

We believe in Jesus Christ Thy unique Son: the true Light that lighteth every man; the express image of Thy goodness;

Who, for us men and for our salvation, lived in this world and died upon the Cross: yet behold! He is alive for evermore, our Lord and Judge.

We believe in the Holy Spirit, Giver of life and grace: Who sheweth us Thy way of freedom, truth and love.

We believe in the Catholic Church, Christ's Fellowship in earth and heaven: the Communion of Saints; the forgiveness of sins; and life in Thee which shall have no end. *Amen.*

Then may be sung

A Hymn,

or there may follow a Homily set forth by authority, or

The Sermon.

After which may follow

A Hymn.

And during this hymn, or, if there be no hymns, while the Celebrant shall recite a suitable Sentence or Sentences, there shall be placed upon the Holy Table Bread and Wine enough for those present to receive a little, and the Alms shall be received and presented.

Then shall the Congregation kneel, and the Celebrant may bid special prayers and thanksgivings, after which he shall say

The Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church.

Almighty and everlasting God, Who through Thy Prophets and Saints hast taught us to make prayers and supplications, and to give thanks, for all men; we humbly beseech Thee most mercifully to accept our alms and oblations and to receive these our prayers which we offer unto Thy Divine Majesty; beseeching Thee to inspire continually the universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord; and grant that all they that do confess Thy holy Name may agree in the truth of Thy holy Word, and live in unity and godly love.

We beseech Thee also to lead all nations in the way of righteousness and peace; and so to direct all Kings and Rulers that under them Thy people may be godly and quietly governed. And grant especially to Thy servant N., our King, and to all that are put in authority under him, that they may truly and impartially minister justice, to the correction of wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of Thy true religion, and virtue.

Give grace, O heavenly Father, to all Bishops and Ministers, especially to Thy servant N., our Bishop, that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth Thy true and living Word and rightly and duly administer Thy holy Sacraments.

Guide and prosper, we pray Thee, all those who are labouring to spread the Gospel, and enlighten with Thy Spirit all places of education and learning; that the whole world may be filled with the knowledge of Thy truth, and learn, through Christ, in all things to love Thee, and Thee alone, the only God.

And to all Thy People give Thy heavenly grace; especially to this congregation here present; that with meek heart and due reverence they may hear, and receive, Thy holy Word, truly serving Thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life, and, seeking only what is right and good, may alway labour cheerfully, as unto Thee.

We most humbly beseech Thee of Thy goodness, O Lord, to comfort and succour all them who in this transitory life are in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity.

We commend to Thy gracious keeping all Thy Servants departed this life. May Thy light shine upon them, and may they ever be learning more of Thee. And here we praise and magnify Thee for Thy Saints; beseeching Thee that, being compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, we may run with patience the race that is set before us; and with them receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away.

O Father, grant us these things that we have prayed for in the Name of Jesus Christ. *Amen.*

After which shall the Celebrant say

THE INVITATION.

Ye that do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbours, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God and walking from henceforth in His holy ways; draw near with faith, and take this holy Sacrament to your comfort; and make your humble confession to Almighty God, meekly kneeling upon your knees.

Then shall be repeated together

THE CONFESSION.

Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Maker of all things, Judge of all men; we acknowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness, which we from time to time most grievously have committed, by thought, word, and deed, against Thy Divine Majesty. We do earnestly repent, and are heartily sorry for these our misdoings. Have mercy upon us, have mercy upon us, most merciful Father. Forgive us all that is past. And grant that we may ever hereafter serve and please Thee in newness of life, to the honour and glory of Thy Name; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

After which the Celebrant, or the Bishop, if he be present, shall pronounce

THE ABSOLUTION.

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, Who of His great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them that with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto Him; have mercy

upon you; pardon and deliver you from all your sins; confirm and strengthen you in all goodness; and bring you to eternal life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

And all, or some, of

THE COMFORTABLE WORDS.

Hear what comfortable words our Saviour Christ saith unto all that truly turn to Him:

Come unto Me, all that travail and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you.—*St. Matthew* xi, 28.

Him that cometh to Me, I will in no wise cast out.

—*John* vi, 37.

I am the Bread of Life; he that cometh to Me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.

—*John* vi 35.

Behold I stand at the door and knock. If any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in and sup with him, and he with me.—*Rev.* iii, 20.

Hear also what Saint Paul saith:

This is a true saying, and worthy of all men to be received, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.

—*I Tim.* i, 15.

Hear also what Saint John saith:

So God loved the world, that He gave His unique Son, to the end that all that believe in Him should not perish, but have eternal life.—*John* iii, 16.

Then shall the Celebrant say, or sing, the people joining in as directed,

THE SURSUM CORDA;

THE PREFACE;

THE SANCTUS.

Lift up your hearts.

People We lift them up unto the Lord.

Let us give thanks unto our Lord God.

People It is meet and right so to do.

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto Thee, O Holy Lord, Father Almighty, Everlasting God :

Here shall follow the Proper Preface for the day, if any be appointed.

Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of Heaven, we laud and magnify Thy glorious Name; evermore praising Thee, and saying :

All. Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts. Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory : glory be to Thee, O Lord most High.

And then shall the Celebrant pronounce immediately

THE CONSECRATION.

All glory be to Thee, almighty Father, Who through the precious Life and Death and mighty Resurrection of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, hast redeemed us. We Thy humble servants do celebrate, and set forth before Thy divine Majesty with these Thy gifts of Bread and Wine, the Memorial which He hath willed for us.

We do not presume to come to this Thy table, O heavenly Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in Thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under Thy table. But hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee! Vouchsafe to pour out now Thy sanctifying and life-giving Spirit; and grant that we, receiving these Thy creatures of Bread and Wine, may be partakers of the most blessed Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.

Who, in the same night that He was betrayed, took Bread; and when He had given thanks He brake it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my Body, which is given for you. Likewise after supper He took the Cup; and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood of the New Covenant, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins.

Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat this Bread and to drink this Cup of the Communion of our Saviour Christ, that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us. *Amen.*

After which may be said, or sung,

O Lamb of God, that takest away the sin of the world : have mercy upon us.

O Lamb of God, that takest away the sin of the world : have mercy upon us.

O Lamb of God, that takest away the sin of the world; grant us Thy peace.

Then shall follow immediately

THE COMMUNION.

And the Celebrant shall first receive the Communion in both kinds, and then proceed to deliver the same to the Bishops and other Ministers in like manner (if any be present), and after that to the people in order, into their hands, all meekly kneeling. And other Ministers, being present, may assist him in the Administration. And the Minister that delivereth the Bread shall say, either singly to each one that receiveth, or aloud and distinctly once for all those kneeling before the Holy Table, but as addressing each one in particular :

The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thee unto life eternal. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.

And the Minister that delivereth the Cup shall say :

The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thee unto life eternal. Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

Or if the number of communicants be great, the Minister may, instead of the above Words of Administration, say, once aloud and distinctly, to the whole number of them that kneel before the Holy Table:

The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for you, and His Blood which was shed for you, preserve you unto life eternal. Take this in remembrance that Christ died for you and feed on Him in your hearts by faith with thanksgiving.

And during the Communion may be sung, kneeling, a hymn or anthem. And the people having all returned to their places,

and the Minister having reverently placed upon the Holy Table what remaineth of the Consecrated Elements, all shall say, or sing:

Our Father, Which art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name: Thy Kingdom come; Thy Will be done; in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the Kingdom, the Power, and the Glory, for ever and ever. *Amen.*

After which, their souls now united to their Lord, the Congregation shall humbly crave to offer the sacrifice of their own selves to God (the Minister speaking for them) in

The Prayer of Thanksgiving and Oblation.

O Lord and heavenly Father, we Thy humble servants entirely desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. We thank Thee for Thy holy Name, which Thou hast made to dwell in our hearts; and for the knowledge, faith and immortality which Thou hast revealed to us through Jesus Christ.

And here we offer and present unto Thee ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto Thee; humbly beseeching Thee that we may be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction. And as we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of Thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people, we beseech Thee, O heavenly Father, that we may continue in that holy Fellowship, and do all such good works as Thou hast prepared for us to walk in.

Remember, Lord, Thy Church, to deliver her from evil, and to perfect her in Thy love. As this Bread that is broken was scattered upon the earth and gathered together and made one, and as this wine outpoured is one life of the fruit of the vine; so gather, Lord, Thy children, from the ends of the earth into Thy Kingdom. Let grace come, and let Thy Church be one, to do Thy work and manifest Thy glory. Alleluia. *Amen.*

Then shall the Celebrant lead the people, kneeling or standing, in saying or singing

THE GLORIA.

Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace, good-will among men. We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee, we glorify Thee, we give thanks to Thee for Thy great glory, O Lord God, Heavenly King, God the Father Almighty.

Hail, Gladdening Light of the Immortal Father, Jesu Christ. Worthy art Thou at all times to be sung, O Son of God, Who givest life. Thou only art holy; Thou only art the Lord; Thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Spirit, art most high in the glory of God the Father. *Amen.*

Then the Minister, or the Bishop if he be present, turning to the people, shall pronounce

THE BLESSING.

The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord: and the blessing of God Almighty, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, be amongst you and remain with you always. *Amen.*

And while what is left of the Consecrated Elements is consumed by the Minister, or others, or after they have consumed them, there may be sung

A HYMN.

PROPER PREFACES.

Upon CHRISTMAS DAY, *and until the* EPIPHANY.

Because Thou didst give Jesus Christ to be born as at this time for us; and by the mystery of Thine Incarnate Word the new light of Thy Brightness hath shined in our hearts; whereby we have been brought to the true knowledge of Thee. Therefore, *etc.*

Upon THE EPIPHANY, *and seven days after; also upon the feasts of* THE PRESENTATION (*or Purification*) *and* THE ANNUNCIATION, *if desired.*

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord; Who, in substance of our

mortal flesh, made manifest Thy glory; whereby we have been brought out of darkness into His own marvellous light. Therefore, *etc.*

Upon the feasts of The Presentation (*or Purification*) *and* The Annunciation, *if desired.*

Because Thou didst give Jesus Christ Thine only Son to be born for our salvation; Who by the operation of the Holy Spirit was made very man of the substance of our Lady Mary, His mother. Therefore, *etc.*

Upon The Thursday before Easter.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord; Who, having loved His own that were in the world, loved them unto the end; and, on the night before He suffered, sitting at meat with His disciples, set forth these Holy Mysteries; that we, redeemed by His death and quickened by His Resurrection, may be partakers of His own heavenly life. Therefore, *etc.*

Upon Easter Day, *and seven days after.*

But chiefly are we bound to praise Thee for the glorious Resurrection of Jesus Christ, our Saviour; Who, by His victory over sin and death, hath opened wide the gates of Heaven; where now with Thee, in glorious Majesty, He liveth and reigneth, King of Kings and Lord of Lords. Therefore, *etc.*

Upon Ascension Day, *and until* Whit-Sunday.

Through Jesus Christ, the King of glory; Who, having manifested Himself to His disciples in the power of His Resurrection, is now exalted to the Heaven of Heavens; that where He is we also may ascend in heart and mind, and with Thee continually dwell. Therefore, *etc.*

Upon Whit-Sunday, *and six days after.*

Who, by Thy Holy and Life-giving Spirit, didst breathe upon the world in Thy Creation and shine upon our hearts in Jesus Christ; that, Thy life within us being kindled into light and love, we may be led into all truth and united with the Disciples of the Lord in one universal Fellowship of grace. Therefore, *etc.*

Upon TRINITY SUNDAY *only.*

Who art one God manifest in Triune Majesty: Power, Wisdom and Love; for Thou, Whom we know through Thy Creation, are the same That hath been declared to us by Jesus Christ, and witnesseth in our own hearts by Thy Holy Spirit. Therefore, *etc.*

Upon ALL SAINTS' DAY; *and upon the feasts of other Saints, if desired.*

Who, in the righteousness of Thy Saints hast given us an example of godly life, and in their blessedness a glorious pledge of the hope of our calling. Therefore, *etc.*

Upon the CONSECRATION OR DEDICATION OF A CHURCH, *if desired; or upon the* ANNIVERSARY *thereof.*

Who, though the Heaven of Heavens cannot contain Thee and Thy glory is in all the world, dost deign to hallow places for Thy worship and in them to pour forth gifts of grace upon Thy faithful people. Therefore, *etc.*

BOOK REVIEWS

TOLERATION IN ENGLAND*

Dr. Jordan has produced a work of massive erudition admirably arranged and documented. The present volume is the second of a series of three tracing the development of thought in England on the subject of religious freedom from the final break with Rome at the accession of Elizabeth down to the Toleration Act of 1689—so, at least, we suppose, for the third volume has yet to appear. The writer has delved into long-forgotten pamphlets which repose in the British Museum and has given us a synopsis of the opinions of all the leading writers of the first half of the seventeenth century—writers as far apart as Bacon and Herrick—who have treated, directly or by inference, on the subject of toleration. Some readers no doubt, would be content with a less exhaustive treatment and may find this encyclopaedic survey a little exhausting. There is a certain amount of perhaps unavoidable repetition. We get a little tired of the words 'dispassion' and 'objectivity.' But as a book of reference these volumes bid fair to become indispensable.

A few years ago interference by the State with the private opinions of citizens seemed to be rapidly becoming a thing of the past. With the acceptance of Mr. Bradlaugh's 'right to affirm,' the story of religious intolerance, so far as it concerned the State, was believed to have come to an end; if the Blasphemy Laws still remained to furnish the Rationalist Press Associa-

**The Development of Religious Toleration in England,* 1603 *to* 1640. By W. K. Jordan, Ph.D., Instructor in History and Tutor in the Division of History, Government and Economics in Harvard University. (George Allen & Unwin. 1936. 21*s.*)

tion with a grievance, it was generally argued that this curious survival was simply a protection against brawling and scurrility. A similar state of things obtained in most civilized countries: absolute freedom of worship was guaranteed in hundreds of ready-made constitutions from China to Peru.

Utterly different are conditions in the new world which is coming into existence. The area within which freedom of speech and writing is permitted is shrinking daily. In Russia it has become necessary to temporal salvation that a man think rightly of the semi-deified Lenin, and a heretical interpretation of a passage in *Das Kapital* may easily involve 'liquidation.' In Germany it is dangerous not to study *Mein Kampf* for example of life and instruction of manners. The powers of the modern State for enforcing conformity are infinitely greater than those possessed by the rulers of the seventeenth century, in whose dominions there were extensive regions where the King's Writ did not run or was of doubtful validity. So it is just as well that while we have opportunity we should turn to Dr. Jordan's volumes to refresh our minds with the arguments that our fathers used on behalf of liberty of prophesying.

We must distinguish between pleas for toleration on the part of minorities who feel that it is all that for the present they can obtain, and the reasoned advocacy of liberty for its own sake. Fortunately, oppressed minorities can hardly help using arguments which manifestly have a wider application. Dr. Jordan quotes some very telling arguments against persecution from the pen of Parsons the Jesuit. But Jesuit and Puritan alike really wished to dominate; the Puritans wished to transform the Church of England after the image of Geneva, and then to treat heretics as Calvin treated Servetus.

> 'We should therefore not be confused when the Puritans plead for toleration and liberty while victims of a minority position which robs their theory of logical fulfilment. It was ever the intention of the Calvinist to gain power and to frame the national Church in the true mould, and, when that could be accomplished, to repudiate immediately the principles both of toleration and voluntary organization. At bottom, the Calvinist dreamed of setting up a theocracy, and Geneva was eternally before him as the fairest example of the Will of God with respect to the organization of the Church.'

A more disinterested plea for liberty of thought was put forward by those whom Dr. Jordan calls the Moderates; we might prefer to call them Modernists. Among the Moderates he classes not only Falkland and his friends Chillingworth and Hales, but also some who in the tempest of the Civil War were swept on to the Parliamentary side, such as Selden and Withers. For in that war, as in so many others,

> 'Friend slew friend not knowing whom he slew.'

Dr. Jordan has some poignant remarks on the fate of the Moderates in the Civil War; one reads them with a sad foreboding at the present time when the whole world seems to be approaching a clash of rival fanaticisms. Shall we see once again those who endeavour to separate the rival gladiators share the fate of St. Telemachus?

> 'The Latitudinarians sprang from the humanistic tradition, which in the previous century had contributed notably to the development of the theory of toleration, and in the English religious crisis they were to suffer the same fate that had engulfed the English humanists during the Reformation. Their tolerance was rooted rather in the individual-

ism of rationalism than in the anarchism of sectarianism. A gentle scepticism and occasionally a deep pessimism pervades their thought. Their position rapidly became untenable as the clash of the opposing dogmatic systems grew sharper and men were compelled either to embrace one cause or the other or to see their influence disappear. Moderation and liberalism cannot flourish in such periods of crisis when the very roots of reason are cut away by the sharp knife of fanaticism and passion. Thus the tragedy of sixteenth century liberalism was to be re-enacted in the seventeenth.'

Mr. Spurgeon once said at a meeting of his co-religionists, 'The Baptists have never persecuted,' and, when the applause with which this statement was received had died away, added, 'They have never been in a position to do so.' Our author, however, has quoted some very interesting passages from some of the Baptists of the period, Smyth, Helwys, Busher, Murton (unhonoured names) showing that they did advocate toleration on broad general grounds. The Continental Anabaptists in the sixteenth century were the extreme Left Wing of the Protestant movement; some at least of them, as Article XXXVIII reminds us, were Communists; even the liberal-minded Zwingli thought nothing of having them drowned in the Lake of Zürich.

Had the religious history of the seventeenth century a happy ending? In a measure it had, for the Toleration Act secured liberty of worship (though not equality of political rights) for the principal sects of Protestant Dissenters. But about the same time the failure of the Comprehension Bill marked the end of the attempt to bring all Englishmen within one spiritual communion. True, the word 'toleration' and the term 'Dissenter,' subsequently softened into 'Nonconformist,' showed that at that time the religion of the Church of England was regarded as the norm and the religion of the sects as a permitted deviation. To-day the word 'Dissenter' is rarely heard, and for 'Nonconformist' is being substituted 'Free Churchman.' The privileges of the Church of England are vanishing away; even the claim that the Coronation should be an exclusively Anglican ceremony is resented.

There seems to be no reason in the nature of things, though there may be in the nature of Englishmen, why the design of Queen Elizabeth and Cecil for a truly National Church should not have succeeded. A similar settlement has prevented the growth of sects on any large scale in Scandinavia; in Denmark ninety-eight per cent. of the population belong officially to the Established Church. Possibly the blame lies in part on the Anglo-Catholic dislike for general principles; Roman Catholics and Dissenters won toleration not because it was felt to be a natural right, but because it was too much trouble to worry them into conformity, and too much effort would have been required to reorganise the Church of England on broad lines. So the Nonconformists were allowed to go out and set up little Churches of their own. We had Free Trade in religion before we had Free Trade in corn. The final result has been a chaos of competing sects and the blatant commercialisation of religion. America has followed in the steps of the Mother Country, and the state of things depicted with such brutal realism in *Elmer Gantry* is the natural consequence. There is something pathetic in noting in the writings of early advocates of toleration the bland confidence they exhibit that, if thought be but left free, the best thought must inevitably prevail. They overlooked that natural taste for the bathos which is inherent in the ordinary human being if left to his own devices.

Dr. Jordan is inclined to throw a large share of the blame for the disruption of our religious life on the Anglo-Catholics, as he calls the followers of Laud. We feel that he is a little less than fair to the Anglican Cyprian; doubtless the *Mayflower* carried the germs of dislike for Laud to the air of New England which our author has breathed. But there is at least a large element of truth in his judgment that the Laudians 'caused a profound rupture both with the historical position of the Church of England and with every Protestant body abroad by insisting that episcopacy was divinely ordered and by enhancing the power of bishops in the Church.'

GAMALIEL MILNER.

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION *

The survey of European civilization which Mr. Eyre is editing and which is intended to embrace seven volumes, reaches in the third and fourth volumes perhaps the most controversial of its themes, the development of mediaeval Europe and the breach of its unity by the Reformation movement. The reader will examine therefore the contents of these volumes with especial interest to ascertain whether they form a safe guide for his feet through the labyrinthine paths of controversial centuries. At the outset it must be observed that the reputation of the third volume rests upon the contributions of Professor D. C. Douglas and of Professor A. E. Taylor, whose chapters comprise roughly half its pages; whilst the scholarly reputation of the fourth volume rests largely upon the essay of Professor F. M. Powicke on 'The Reformation in England,' which covers only 140 pages out of a total of seven and a quarter hundred.

In the volume dealing with the Middle Ages Professor Taylor writes with the mastery of knowledge and economy of words characteristic of his writings, on the historical development of ancient and mediaeval philosophy. No higher praise need be sought for his chapter. It can be read with equal pleasure and profit; for it conveys the maximum of information in a style which would persuade the reader that he is acquiring knowledge without effort. Similarly Professor Douglas' survey of mediaeval Europe merits no lesser epithet than brilliant. It is a masterly achievement which almost takes one's breath away; and it is not an exaggeration to say that it is probably the best sketch within equal compass of European history from the barbarian invasions to the culmination of the mediaeval genius in the thirteenth century. The civilization whose development he traces had a triple tradition: 'It was European; it was non-national; it was above all, ecclesiastical.' Accordingly Mr. Douglas begins with a survey of the very different reigns of Theodoric the Ostrogoth and of Justinian, passing thence to the achievement of Clovis the Frank, whose work was destined to have elements of permanence despite the menace of Islam and that of the Vikings, of which in turn a succinct and illuminating account is given. Thence the way lies open for a sketch of the rise of the Papacy, and of the revival of the Imperial title by Charlemagne and the Ottos. Mr. Douglas passes next to consider the rise of local, or national, monarchies in Europe and England; and to the conflicts of civil and ecclesiastical authorities under such dominating pontiffs as Gregory VII and Innocent III. Meanwhile the Crusading movement had contributed another chapter to the complex history of the interaction of east and west, here graphically

* *European Civilization: Its Origin and Development.* Edited by Edward Eyre. Vols. III (The Middle Ages), and IV (The Reformation). (Oxford University Press. 1935-36. 18/- each.)

delineated. It would, however, be tedious and superfluous to specify the several items of Professor Douglas' record. It must suffice to say that his narrative of political events is at once succinct and lucid.

More important, and probably of greater value, than the survey afforded of political events is the description of the salient features of mediaeval institutions and of the development of culture. Here Mr. Douglas excels. Into his chapter on mediaeval institutions is packed the results of the researches of many students into the organization of the papal curia, the constitutional experiments of the several religious orders, and the economic foundations of mediaeval society. Thus a clear idea may be obtained of the relations of bishops to parish priests, the value of the work of the monastic foundations, and the causes and agents of the growth of the papal monarchy. It may be questioned whether sufficient emphasis is laid upon the pagan and Teutonic origins of the parish and its priest, since these origins constituted an intractable element in the ecclesiastical organisation throughout the middle ages and since. In tracing the development of mediaeval culture, Mr. Douglas indicated the literary standards and survivals of the early middle ages, the rise of the humanistic renaissance and its culmination in the universities of mediaeval Europe. His ten chapters present a clear, well-informed, and well-written conspectus of the political, ecclesiastical, and cultural development of Europe, which the present reviewer has read with sustained interest and pleasure.

The transition from Professor Douglas to M. Jean Guiraud is noticeable at once. The attempt made to survey the complex development of Europe during the later middle ages fails at the hands of Professor Guiraud, for his narrative tends to become a mere aggregation of facts without the persuasive interpretation necessary to make them palatable to the reader. A straightforward narrative account is given of events and persons; but, as is particularly observable in the account of the Renaissance, many of the facts recorded seem to lack meaning and purpose. This failure is more noticeable in the survey of the Renaissance, because in this aspect of the story simple dates and events do not speak for themselves. The reader who poses the natural question as to the influence of the new learning upon the religious ideas, the theological definitions, and the ecclesiastical institutions of the middle ages will find no satisfactory attempt at answer from Professor Guiraud.

In the fourth volume dealing with the Reformation, too much of its contents represent the conventional Roman Catholic apologia for events rather than the endeavour to ascertain all the facts and to seek for an adequate historical explanation. The accounts of the Continental Reformations are apologetic and partial; they are scrappy, and fail to account for the movement as it happened on the stage of history. In part the fault lies in the lack of endeavour to relate the new learning to the religious rebellions, and in part to the failure to admit the volume of criticism existing in several countries against the doctrines and practices of the Church, and not only against its financial and administrative abuses. Thanks to the insular characteristics of the English Reformation, Professor Powicke is able to contribute an essay on this theme, which is at once the distinction of the volume and the severest exhibition of the shortcomings of most of the remaining essays. Upon the political and constitutional aspects of the English Reformation from Henry VIII to the end of Elizabeth's reign he has written a delightful, urbane, and scholarly essay, of which it is perhaps the best praise to say that it is suffused with the spirit of its subject. It would be impertinent to offer compliments upon its scholarship and insight;

for both these qualities are expected by Professor Powicke's readers. Perhaps the qualities of his survey are best exemplified in his judicious handling of the controverted problems associated with the dissolution of the monasteries. The chief criticism to be made of his essay may be stated in his own words: 'With the details of theological and liturgical controversy I have not been concerned'; for the limitation, albeit self-imposed, is serious in an interpretation of the English Reformation. The reader misses the grave emphasis which Canon E. W. Watson was wont always to lay upon the widespread dissatisfaction with and repulsion from the usages and doctrines associated with the Mass, the breakdown of the traditional religious system and the popular quest for some satisfying substitute, and the influence of German opinions in England during the earlier and imitative stages of the Tudor reformation. Similarly under Elizabeth the reader misses the tracing of the effect of foreign influences, the reference of matters to foreign reformers with a substantial deference of tone on the part of English leaders, and the causes and basis of the later construction of a theological and historical defence of the *via media* of the English Church. The responsibility for this omission may fall partly upon the comparative brevity of Professor Powicke's essay and partly upon his self-imposed limitations. But these limitations are regrettable both in themselves, from the standpoint of the balance of the volume, and because of the value of what has been included.

Apart from Professor Powicke's essay this volume is noteworthy only for the contribution of Mr. Christopher Hollis on 'Religious Persecution,' which is written with similar objectivity in the record of fact, bears a scholarly character, and is also inspired with a definite point of view. The differences of tone and fact between Professor Powicke and Professor Cristiani where they touch the same theme of the reign of Elizabeth, are illuminating revelations of the differing standards of historical writing embraced within the covers of the same volume. Certainly the student of European history and of the development of Christianity who omits to read the essays of Professors Douglas, Taylor, and Powicke, and the somewhat unrelated chapter of Mr. Hollis, will lose much both of pleasure and profit. He will wonder how they come to have such strange bedfellows. The two volumes may be recommended with confidence to students who have sufficient knowledge to discern and discriminate the several standards of composition offered to them. The danger of the publication, which is real and serious, is that persons not competent so to criticise and discern may be led by the value of these above-mentioned essays to suppose that their intrinsic merits and the authority of their authors serve as a guarantee for the scholarship and objectivity of the remaining contributors.

N. Sykes.

THE APOSTOLIC *KERYGMA**

The importance of this little book is not to be measured by its size and price. It contains only three lectures and an appendix, but it is obviously founded upon a close acquaintance with much contemporary literature, and it is to be heartily commended to all who wish to know something of the present position of New Testament criticism.

It is a field in which there have been great advances since the war. For fifty years and more scholars devoted themselves to the critical study of the New Testament documents, and there emerged theories concerning the

* *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments.* By C. H. Dodd, Norris-Hulse Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. (Hodder and Stoughton. 5/-.)

literary sources of the Synoptic Gospels which have won general acceptance. Then the question of interpretation came to the front, and such scholars as Wrede and Schweitzer insisted on the importance of a study of contemporary Jewish beliefs for the understanding of the life and teaching of Jesus. In particular they emphasized the influence of Jewish eschatological hopes which found expression in the apocalyptic literature. This was a timely reminder that the teaching of Jesus was not addressed in the first place to an audience of modern Englishmen or Germans. Without question the apocalyptic school of critics helped scholars to realize the importance of a study of the background if the New Testament is to be read intelligently.

In the last twenty years the background studied has been that of primitive Christianity, rather than that of Judaism, and the Form-critics have invited us to consider the conditions under which traditions about Jesus took shape. They have insisted that the earliest Christians did not belong to the literary classes, that they were not historically-minded, that they were less interested in the past than in the future, and that in so far as they preserved reminiscences of the life of Jesus they did so for reasons other than those which account for the interest of later generations. Christianity began as an urgent message of salvation in the face of coming judgment, and when its earliest preachers referred to the actual events of the earthly life of Jesus, they did so, not from a desire to make real the picture of the historic Christ, but to illustrate their main theme, that God had sent His Messiah into the world to inaugurate the New Age, and that the Consummation of the Age might shortly be expected.

Our Gospels do not belong to this primitive period, but they were written to supply the needs of a time when the character of Christian preaching had to some extent changed, and the outlook of believers was not quite what it had been. The preachers of Christianity still presented their message in the form of eschatology, as the fulfilment of God's age-long plan for the world; but as the expectation of an immediate return of Christ grew dim, more interest was taken in the record of His earthly ministry. The evangelists then collected the fragmentary material which had been used by Christian preachers from the first in illustration of their Gospel, and wove it into a connected account of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus.

Professor Dodd's contention, which he may be said to have established, is that in so doing the evangelists still had in mind the plan of the primitive *kerygma,* and that they skilfully selected and arranged incidents and sayings, not merely in order to satisfy historical curiosity, but to illustrate the main elements of the primitive Christian preaching. In this book he begins with an acute study of the primitive *kerygma,* the nature and contents of which we may gather from the Acts and the Pauline Epistles. He then shows how the Gospel of Mark is constructed upon this framework. Most important is the fact that Mark's eschatology is on the whole 'realized eschatology' which looks back to the work of Christ in introducing the New Age. The consummation still lies ahead, but in the coming of Christ in accordance with prophecy the promises of God have been fulfilled. In their several ways Matthew and Luke modify the Marcan presentation: Matthew's eschatology is notably futurist, and Luke is interested in Jesus as the friend and lover of men, the ideal for Christian conduct; but John returns to the Marcan scheme, and, abandoning futurist eschatology, builds round the outline of the historical section of the Apostolic preaching a picture of Christ as the giver of eternal life.

'His theme is life eternal, that is to say, in eschatological language,

the life of the Age to Come, but life eternal as realized here and now through the presence of Christ by His Spirit in the Church.'

Professor Dodd is very frank in facing the facts, but he is not carried away by modern tendencies, and on the whole his conclusions are reassuring. What is most valuable is the way in which he establishes the continuity of the Christian message, and the fact that, although the Gospel writers relied upon traditions which had undergone a considerable measure of development, they were still in touch with a *kerygma* which went right back to the earliest days.

'Wherever the Gospels keep close to the matter and form of the *kerygma*, there we are in touch with a tradition coeval with the Church itself.'

That is a point of which some of the form-critics need to be reminded.

The book should be read and read again. Those who follow Professor Dodd will surely recognize the guidance of the Holy Spirit during those critical years in which Christianity was passing from the narrow circle of contemporary Judaism into the wider world of Hellenic culture.

P. GARDNER-SMITH.

A SURVEY OF AMERICAN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT*

When one surveys the developments and trends in American religious thought, the impression is that most thinkers are turning more and more toward two extremes. On the one hand, the conservative minds are approaching supernaturalism. They are turning away from the methods and results of liberal thought and are finding solace in positions which are based on reconstructed types of revelation. On the other hand, a great number of thinkers, following the methods of liberalism and extending them, are tending to accept positions which have a decided naturalistic bias. These men accept the findings of science and they are seeking to find a 'scientific basis' for religion. They are experimentalists and they believe that truth is not absolute. Whatever partial truths we may obtain are but stepping-stones for further analyses and new truths.

In between the reactionaries and the radicals are those who seek a middle ground. They have much in common with the supernaturalists, but they seek to form their foundations by the use of empirical methods. They see God not only as transcendent (emphasised by the supernaturalists) but also as immanent (emphasised by the naturalists). These men might be called 'intuitionists.' Also in this middle position are the idealists. This includes the absolutists and the personalists.

Professor Wieman (of the University of Chicago) and Professor Meland (of Central College, Fayette, Missouri) have collaborated in the effort to classify all the philosophers of religion in one or another of these categories. In many cases, the classifications seem to this reviewer somewhat forced; but on the whole the treatment is extremely fair. For one who would know just what are the tendencies of American thought and what are the positions of individual philosophers, this volume is extremely valuable. About thirty-eight of the fifty-six men enumerated in the table of contents have positions which are described in some detail. The others are merely mentioned as belonging to the classification. Among the important men who are treated more fully, the following might be mentioned: Tillich, Royce, Hocking, Rufus Jones, E. S. Brightman, D. C. Macintosh, William Adams Brown, Walter Horton, Santayana, Hartley Burr Alexander, John

* *American Philosophies of Religion.* By Henry Nelson Wieman and Bernard Eugene Meland. (Willett and Clark. Chicago. 1936. $3.00.)

E. Boodin, Robert L. Calhoun, A. N. Whitehead, E. S. Ames, John Dewey, Shailer Mathews, and H. N. Wieman.

There are three introductory chapters dealing with the present situation. The purpose, we are told, is to bring the confusion of modern thinking 'into clearer perspective, to make more articulate the significant tendencies and turnings in modern thought, and to provide, as it were, a bird's-eye view of the whole field of American philosophy of religion and its literature' (p. 5). It is necessary that we make use of philosophy of religion as a basis for our theologies. Philosophy of religion seeks to discover the essentials; theologies present them in a form conducive to religious devotion.

'The distinction between theology and philosophy of religion may be made clearer if we compare religion to eating. If a religion is like eating, then the reality which interests the religious person is analogous to food. In that case the theologian is the one who puts this food into such form that it is palatable and can be most readily eaten. The theologian is a good cook. But the philosopher is a dietitian. He does not prepare the food for eating. He does not present God in a form that is digestible to the ordinary person. That is not his business. He does not talk about jelly and fried chicken and cake. He talks about vitamins and proteins. Now, no one ever hungered for vitamins and proteins. Of course, what he really needed were these, but he could not take them in the abstract form of vitamins and proteins, although these were truly the essentials. He had to have them in the form of jelly and fried chicken and the like. The theologian talks about beefsteak and lettuce. The philosopher talks about starches and calories. Consequently, simple souls are likely to think that the philosopher is discussing something that has no connection with their yearnings. In this they are mistaken, but their mistake is very understandable' (p. 16).

It is necessary that we turn to the problem of religious diet. No longer is it a case of merely changing the flavour. We must take up the essentials, re-examine them, and then reconstruct our whole diet. This book is an attempt to find what diets are being suggested. At the end of the presentation by the two collaborators, there are four short essays by representatives of the four positions. George W. Richards speaks for the supernaturalists. E. S. Brightman speaks for the idealists. D. C. Macintosh speaks for the intuitionists (mistakenly called 'romanticists' by the authors). And E. S. Ames speaks for the naturalists. Wieman, himself a naturalist, writes the conclusion. Supernaturalism will not die out, believes Wieman, but the scientific method will lead to a naturalistic philosophy of religion. 'Even after the specialized sciences have passed over the great divide from mechanisms to organic connections, it will still take some time for common sense, which is the starting-point for all naturalistic inquiry including the religious, to make the great transition. It will also take time for the basic presuppositions of our total view of reality to make the change. Not until this occurs shall we have a naturalism which can give ample room for the highest aspirations of love and faith, hope and beauty. The deepest currents are running in this direction, we believe' (pp. 347-348).

This effort of Professors Wieman and Meland is to be highly commended. That such an ambitious plan would satisfy all is more than they could hope. That such a result should have great value in clearing the mist of philosophical thinking was to be expected. There are many quotations from the writers who are discussed. The footnotes are adequate for scholarly reference and so are the indices.

RANDOLPH CRUMP MILLER.

Church Divinity School of the Pacific,
Berkeley, California, U.S.A.

THE GREATEST OF THE THREE*

The Church of England in the nineteenth century possessed a galaxy of great bishops, but it is possible that Brooke Foss Westcott was the greatest of them all. He possessed powers of vision and of sympathy which made him both a profound teacher and a wise administrator. He really believed in the working and influence of the Holy Spirit in human affairs. When he was universally congratulated on his successful settlement of the Durham coal strike of 1892 and was asked by many how he had done it, he wrote:

> 'What amazes me is the ignorance of these editors. Of course it was nothing but the power of the Spirit of God.'

Besides believing intensely in the Holy Spirit, Westcott believed in the Bible, especially in the New Testament and supremely in the Johannine writings. But the New Testament must be studied in the Greek if full value were to be obtained. Modern Anglo-Catholic proposals to permit the Vulgate to be studied by ordinands as an alternative to the Greek Testament would have filled him with pained astonishment. Indeed the Vulgate's mis-translation (*fold* for *flock*) in the crucial passage: 'That they may become one flock under one shepherd' has led to, and helped to perpetuate, a most grievous misconception of the character of Christian unity.

Bishop Westcott believed strongly in the British Empire. He was no jingo, for his whole desire for that Empire was that it should be built on moral and spiritual foundations; nevertheless he had sufficient good sense to see that the right use of material resources did not mean that material resources could be dispensed with in empire building. For Westcott, the British Empire was what the Diaspora was for St. Paul, the seed-bed for the planting of the Christian religion in the Pagan world.

Westcott was an equally strong believer in the Union of Church and State. Endowments might be sacrificed, but Establishment never. He was equally devoted to the Crown appointment of bishops. He believed:

> 'The detached lay view, as represented by the leading layman of England, is the wisest. A Prime Minister must have developed the gift of judging men and of gauging public opinion very correctly. He pays the penalty at once if he is wrong. He is much more likely to recommend the right man for a diocese than any number of so-called experts.'

Westcott, a most profound Christian, was not prevented by his Christian convictions from being a devoted admirer of English methods and English character. He said on one occasion: 'I am an Englishman first and a Churchman afterwards,' which meant for him that in England and throughout the British Empire the Church exists, not to serve its own interests, but the interests of the English people. Like many men of broad views, Westcott was charged by narrow-minded persons, who did not understand him, with being vague and indefinite. He retorted on one occasion:

> 'It is possible, you know, to be quite definite and absolutely wrong.'

The fact is, in treating any theme, he is much more concerned with the centre than with the circumference and although he had an immense knowledge of facts and a most accurate knowledge of them, yet for him facts were only significant in so far as they served to illustrate principles. There was probably only one department of which he was entirely ignorant—that of sport. The Bishop had never seen the Derby run and caused some

* *Memories of Brooke Foss Westcott.* By Rev. A. G. B. West. (W. Heffer & Sons, Cambridge. 1936. Price 2/- net.)

amusement by remarking innocently: 'Once though, I very nearly did. I happened to be passing through Derby by train that very day.'

The writer of this notice was discussing with Professor Peake the relative merits of Lightfoot and Westcott as exegetes. Peake remarked: 'You know that it was said that Lightfoot made difficult things easy but Westcott made easy things difficult.' And Peake added: 'When you come to think about it, that is greater praise for Westcott than for Lightfoot.'

Westcott's opinion of *Hymns, Ancient and Modern,* is well known but it is worth repeating:

> 'I think *Hymns Ancient and Modern* have done more harm to popular theology than any other book—except Milton's poems. In a great many cases I do not understand what they mean, and I don't think the writers did.'

The Rev. A. G. B. West, an old pupil of Westcott, has done well to recall for those for whom Westcott is little more than a name, his vivid impressions of an English saint. H.D.A.M.

ANGELS*

The Angelic Doctor, drawing liberally upon Pseudo-Dionysius, was able to give the Catholic Church full information about the angelic hierarchy. The modern student must be less ambitious and go to work chiefly as an historian. Mr. Langton has written a scholarly work, examining the beliefs about angels as they are found (1) in the Old Testament, (2) in Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic literature, and (3) in Jewish Rabbinic literature. The book is full of interesting and curious information. Especially fascinating to the lover of the strange and fantastic are the speculations of the *Targums*. The greatest angel of all was Metatron, who does not enter the Old or New Testaments. As for Michael, he was the principal angel of the three who came to Abraham at Mamre, and as such occupied the middle position, with Gabriel on his right and Raphael on his left. Michael and Gabriel were also present at the marriage of Adam. Michael too was the angel of the Burning Bush, though some say it was Gabriel. After the death of Moses it was Michael and Gabriel who prepared his bed—a highly elaborate bed, with silk and jewels. Michael, also, according to one authority is a great high-priest who offers sacrifice upon an altar in heaven. Gabriel it was, however, who struck the servants of the Egyptian princess who would have restrained their mistress from drawing the infant Moses out of the water, and it was he who delivered the three 'children' from the burning fiery furnace. Furthermore, when Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter, Gabriel descended from heaven and planted a reed in the sea, which formed a sandbank whereon a city was built. This is a very interesting and scholarly work. J.C.H.

THE HIDDEN SOUL OF HARMONY†

This volume of Robert Bridges' Collected Prose contains his essays on musical subjects. The essays deal with hymns and chanting and, for the most part, have long been familiar to church musicians. Reprinted, however, in the present volume, together with a paper on 'The Musical

* *The Ministries of Angelic Powers.* By Edward Langton, B.D. (James Clarke & Co. 1936. 3/6.)

† *Collected Essays, Papers, etc., of Robert Bridges. Nos. XXI to XXVI.* (Oxford University Press. 5/-.)

Setting of Poetry,' they should form a valuable addition to the church musician's library.

The volume contains the two articles Robert Bridges wrote on English chanting. The first was published in the *Musical Antiquary* in April, 1911, and the second was written for the *Prayer Book Dictionary*. There is also a Preface to a collection of psalms which Dr. Bridges noted in speech rhythm, and one psalm (xvi) from this collection is printed at the end of the book, thus helping the reader to realise the kind of musical treatment Dr. Bridges advocated for the psalms. The principles of chanting which lay behind this collection of psalms and which Dr. Bridges so persistently advocated have formed the basis of most of the new speech rhythm psalters. A number of these psalters have in recent years been published—*The English Psalter, The Parish Psalter, The Psalter newly Pointed* and *The Oxford Psalter* may be mentioned—and are gradually replacing the Old and New Cathedral Psalters. The adoption of these Psalters has led to a great improvement in the standard of chanting and to a more intelligent use of the psalms.

Dr. Bridges is pessimistic concerning the Congregational rendering of the psalms. He says:

> 'Congregational singing of the Canticles is possible and should be assured before the psalms are attempted. But if it is decided that evervone should sing the psalms, then nicety must be relinquished and all the musician can do is to play loudly on the organ.'

In most churches the congregation generally makes feeble efforts to join with the choir in the singing of the psalms. There are, however, a number of churches, generally of the Anglo-Catholic type, where the congregation sits throughout the singing of the psalms and makes no attempt to join in the chanting. One thing is certain: if congregations are to be encouraged to join in the singing of the psalms they must be provided with fully printed psalters, without which intelligent singing of the psalms is impossible.

The principles outlined in the essay on hymn-singing which formed the basis of *The Yattendon Hymnal*, which Dr. Bridges edited, have largely been embodied in *The English Hymnal* and *Songs of Praise*.

O. R. Clarke.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

THE RESIGNATIONS AND THE PURLEY BRANCH.

Sir,

I am asked by our local Branch of the Modern Churchmen's Union to send you the following Resolution, which was passed unanimously by a Branch Meeting on February 8th:

'That this meeting of the Purley and East Surrey Branch has heard with grave concern of the differences within the Council which have led to the withdrawal of the President and other trusted and valued leaders of the Union; and considers that steps should be taken without delay to summon a Meeting of Members, with a view to informing them as to the present position and giving an opportunity for conference with regard to the future of the Union.'

The discussion showed a feeling that insufficient information had as yet been given as to the causes of the resignations; and a feeling also that the members of the Union owe it to their leaders — none of whom we wish to lose—to give them an opportunity of telling us what are the issues involved, and of hearing what the members themselves think.

The Branch desires to give the Resolution publicity so that other branches, as well as individual members, may be able to consider whether they wish to take similar action.

A. FLOYD,
Hon. Secretary.

46 Downs Court Road, Purley, Surrey.

THE RESIGNATIONS.

SIR,

With reference to the recent resignations of officials from the M.C.U. and the somewhat obscure reason for this action I would venture to make a few general observations.

I deprecate the tendency to divide members of the Union into liberal 'Catholics' and liberal 'Protestants.' Within the Union we are 'Modern Churchmen' with certain formulated aims. We should welcome to membership all who are honestly desirous of forwarding those aims. But complete loyalty to our aims should be the test. If we are united in support of our aims, then I think it does not much matter what we call ourselves in other associations. But we stand first and foremost for reality and truth. People who desire to join the Union should do so simply as liberals or modernists with the outlook and aims which are indicated in the constitution of the Union.

Another point I would submit is that the Modern Churchman must be prepared to apply this modern outlook evenly all round. It is not enough to be a modernist on questions of Biblical research. The critical method must equally be applied to questions relating to the Church, the Ministry and the Sacraments, and it is for Modern Churchmen to say frankly what they believe to be true on these questions. For Modern Churchmen the primary question is not what views are permissible in the Church of England, but what views accord with truth as we believe we see it. That truth we must affirm. If that affirmation evokes sympathy and response from one school of thought in the Church of England rather than another, then inevitably we shall find ourselves acting with those who are of the same opinion by whatever name they may call themselves. Let us be quite frank about this. We shall only stultify our aims if we seek to include in our Union members for whom the conclusions, or some of the conclusions, are prescribed, whether on questions of Biblical criticism or those of the Church, the Ministry and the Sacraments. On all these questions we must be unfettered in our constructive effort to formulate our views on the restatement of the Christian Faith in the light of history, religious experience, and scientific thought and knowledge.

My last observation is of a more general kind, though not, I think, wholly unrelated to the present situation in our Union and the Church at large.

It has been said that our function should simply be to exhibit 'an attitude of mind.' With great respect to those who hold this view, I submit that the times in which we live require something far more positive and vigorous on the part of Modern Churchmen. The paramount need of institutional Christianity to-day is Unity, Fellowship and Leadership. As the *Times* said in a recent leading article (January 12th) on the teaching

of religion, 'the position is too critical for denominational differences to stand in the way.' I am persuaded that a world whose needs cry out for co-operation and fellowship will not believe in the Christianity of so-called Christian Churches which cannot put the most elementary principles of fellowship into operation within their own borders. Until the Churches as different households of the one Family can, on the sole ground of acknowledging Christ as Lord and Leader, manifest their essential unity by meeting in the Family Meal of the Lord's Supper there is, I believe, no hope for the future of organised Christianity. It is a deplorable perversion of the Holy Communion to make it a Sacrament of division and not of Christian fellowship and unity. The Archbishop was right when he made his great appeal on an undenominational basis. The recall to religion and the seeming crisis in our Union give Modern Churchmen a special opportunity. Let us use it to take stock of our position and to put out some clearer statement of our convictions and aims, which might well prove to be a real contribution to the Archbishop's appeal. That appeal was to the nation at large. Let our appeal also be to that public opinion which is often far more Christian in spirit than Church opinion. Is not the influence of public opinion to be traced in the resolutions of the Bishops of the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation in relation to the admission of divorced persons to Holy Communion?

This should be an inspiration to us and fill us with confidence for the future. The resignations in our Union may mean much or little, but the Union has, in its own way, played too vital and worthy a part in the thinking life of the Anglican Communion to be allowed, if its members can help it, to suffer any setback, for do we not believe that Modernism, and what it implies in Christian thought and practice, is the Beacon which must be fired in the name of Christ to make the recall to religion effective?

6 St. Peter's Close, St. Albans. H. F. WALKER.

THE PRIMATE'S APPEAL AND LAY DIFFICULTIES.

SIR,

The appeal of the Archbishop of Canterbury on the last Sunday of the year was made primarily to the laity, and perhaps you will allow me to make one or two comments from the point of view of the layman.

An inevitable question arises out of the three statements made by the Archbishop, namely, why is there a drift away from religion in a nation which has an instinct for religion and which takes an interest in it?

No one will question the truth of the statements, but there is the greatest diversity of opinion among those who are anxious to find a remedy. The *Church Times* of November 13th says: 'We must bring up our children with clear dogmatic views.' Another statement recently made is: 'We doubt the value of giving Christian teaching in dogmatic form to young people who have received a modern education.' These two views are clearly at variance, and no one who has had experience in dealing with boys and girls between the ages of eleven and eighteen or nineteen in the matter of modern education has much doubt that the latter statement is true.

What happens when these young people begin to think for themselves and are faced with a problem that presents some difficulty? They ask, Why? This is natural; they have been taught to ask why. They have been accustomed to be told why, and they are not prepared, at least not consciously, to allow the consideration of the problem to be prejudiced by the *ipse dixit* of authority.

Consider the effect of adopting the plan advocated. The *Church Times* may or may not have had a strict definition of dogma in mind, but it will be sufficient to interpret it as equivalent to belief. An imposed belief offends against every principle on which modern education is based, and that is why instruction in dogmatic form cannot be given to young people who have received a modern education.

The plan means making the child learn and repeat the creeds. Everything goes well until, at seventeen or eighteen, he begins to think for himself and finds that the creeds he has been taught to repeat do not express what he really believes. Then what follows depends on his honesty; either he accepts the creeds on authority and smothers his doubts, which is dishonest and bad for him, or he rejects the creeds and loses faith in the Church, which is just what the Church is complaining about.

The Archbishop, and others who have spoken or written, assume that the fault for the drift away from religion lies with the people. Is this beyond question? Is it not possible that some responsibility may rest on the Church? To a layman it seems that the Church has remained stationary for 1,500 years and is calling, 'Come back, come back to the fourth century.' The Founder of our Faith said, 'Follow Me.' The people want a church that is in front, calling them on, and until the Church can somehow get in front and substitute 'Follow' for 'Come back' it will not obtain a response to its appeal.

I write as a layman with more than fifty years' association with the forms of public worship of the Church of England who finds it more and more difficult to retain a firm hold. I deplore as much as anyone the drift away from religion, but if I were setting out as a young man I do not think I should seek association with the Church, and it is not satisfactory to feel that the present link consists not so much in an urge to remain as in reluctance to break away.

J.R.F.

[By the same post which brought the above letter we received a private letter from which we give the following extract.—Ed., *M.C.*]

I am not a member of any church but am very much interested in religion, particularly Christianity. So long as churchpeople can each Sunday repeat a creed in which they state they believe in the Virgin Birth and that their *bodies* will rise I could not become a member of such a community. Truth is a lovely thing, and to be told the words do not mean what they imply is to me inconceivable.

Personally, I feel if all these doubtful 'truths' in creed and the thirty-nine Articles could be removed, the Church would gain enormously: people who are repulsed at present by what appears to them either as deceit or deliberate blindness to facts would be attracted to the sincere and beautiful teachings of Christ.

My object in writing to you is to give you the point of view of one of the many outside the Church but who would willingly join it could their reason accept its dogma.

'THE FOOL HATH SAID.'

Sir,

After reading your reviewer's enthusiastic notice of *The Fool Hath Said,* I was curious to see if Mr. Nichols' latest book is different from his earlier ones. It is not. After writing books on gardening, pacifism, the U.S.A. and other subjects, he has now only found a new theme in Christianity.

His manner of writing is a sort of baby-talk for adults, a 'let's pretend' hat we are very simple people. The first part of his book is an exposition f the reasonableness of Christianity; but this is not Mr. Nichols' way of utting it. He talks about a treasure-hunt in which he begs his reader to oin him. The various stages in the argument are hurdles, some of which e finds it difficult to get over, and rungs of a ladder which he has to limb. He even comes to one hurdle (not ladder) with countless rungs, vhich suggests that he himself has not done much hurdling. It is perhaps ot surprising that this part of the book contains many errors of fact, nany false and many mis-stated arguments. One cannot expect a writer vhose books sell so freely to be careful about mere details.

The second part of the book opens with the description of Mr. Nichols t a Group house-party. This is the book's inspiration; the Groups have hanged Mr. Nichols. People think differently about the work of the roups. It is enough to say that those who already know and dislike them vill not change their opinion after reading Mr. Nichols. In conclusion, ne word of advice to the admirers of Mr. Nichols' books. Do not praise neir quality; opinions differ about it. But emphasise their sales. These re facts.

J. K. NETTLEFOLD.

5 Surrey Close, Sprowston, Norwich.
February 1st, 1937.

THE DIVORCE OF HEROD ANTIPAS.

IR,

Before Herod could marry the wife (or widow) of his brother Philip, he ad to divorce a wife who was daughter of an Aretas, an Arabian king. he divorced lady's family took it as a grave insult, and her brother sought engeance. The legality of the divorce from a Jewish standpoint was a natter of concern to Herod because he professed the Jews' religion, and vould not wish it to be said that in Jewish Law the divorce was unlawful. ews who wanted to defend Herod would argue that he had not wronged is wife by divorcing her, because he would have given her 'a bill of ivorcement' which left her free to be married to another husband. He ad not made her an adulteress. On the other hand, many Rabbis would eel shocked at Herod's action, and refuse to stretch the Mosaic ordinance o cover the legality of this divorce. In view of the fate of John the Baptist, ney would prefer to discuss 'divorce' rather than Herod's divorce.

A non-legalistic view of the matter might be that Herod had not wronged e lady by divorcing her, because he himself was a fornicator, who, having oked upon Herodias to lust after her, had already committed adultery ith her in his heart. But is not this the same thing as saying (with avoid-nce of Herod's name), 'Every one that putteth away his wife, saving for e cause of fornication, maketh her an adulteress' (Mt. v, 32)?

Staplehurst Rectory, Kent. A. J. WALKER.
February 2nd, 1937.

ECONOMICS, POLITICS AND CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

IR,

Your remarks on this subject in the January issue are welcome in so r as they stimulate thought on an important issue. But I hope you will low some remarks on the other side of the case.

Your statement that 'it is not the benevolent amateur but the highly ained specialist who is needed to lead humanity through the Wilder-

ness into the Promised Land' seems to me to be altogether wide of the mark. The Apostles were neither benevolent amateurs nor highly trained specialists; they were unlearned and ignorant men who had been with Jesus and were inspired by the spirit of God. It is only too true that good-will and the application (in poultice form) of Christian principles to our economic, racial and national problems will not solve them. In this connection I would commend to your attention and that of your readers the address delivered by the Bishop of Bristol to the League of Nations.* The problems of the Roman Empire were ultimately 'solved' by the disappearance of that Empire and the emergence of the Christian Church. It is this aspect of the matter which you seem to me to ignore.

Further, it is also true that it is difficult to secure agreement among Christians as to what Christian principles are. We are divided on the subjects of peace and war, of the structure of the social order and even of basic principles. It is encouraging that you join in deploring the refusal of the Council of the M.C.U. to give support to the agreed statement on basic principles recently issued by the I.C.F. For you appear in your notes to advocate retreat in face of these difficulties. May I make two more comments on this matter from different angles?

(1) In the U.S.A. there has been a tendency for decent people to avoid politics as a dirty game. This has surely contributed to a situation in which politics have increasingly got into the hands of the worst elements of the population. The one hope of preserving the decencies of our own political life seems to be that Christian people shall play their part in politics as Christian citizens, not trying to separate their life into compartments whereof one is labelled 'religion' and the other 'politics.' This separation is disastrous and contrary to the whole line of development of British democracy.

(2) It seems to some that the Church has been in retreat long enough and the Archbishop has now sounded the recall. If men are to be recalled to religion, still more if they are to be recalled to the existing Churches, it is essential that Christians of differing views on the subject of ethics shall have the courage to work together to find a synthesis of their divergences.

May I give one illustration out of my own experience in regard to the question of war? Neither Christian pacifists nor those who cannot go all the way with them desire war. If the Church could produce an agreed mind that it would refuse to sanction the use of bombs and poison gas on women, children and non-combatants even in a war of defence, the Christian Church would provide a rallying-ground for people in perplexity and would give a clear lead in a controversial matter. In this and our other differences we have a great opportunity to show the world how to respect the rights of minorities and how to combine together up to the limit of our agreement.

F. E. A. SHEPHERD.

Birmingham.

[We think there is a tendency in our correspondent's mind to identify the office of the Christian minister with the duties of the Christian citizen.—ED., *M.C.*]

[We regret that we have been unable to find space for other contributions to this theme.—ED., *M.C.*]

* Published by the I.C.F. at 1*d*.